

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"*
founded 1931.)

VOL. III.

January, 1939.

No. 5

THE LITURGY AND REUNION

THE Roman Church prays for the peace and unity of Christians every time her Mass is celebrated, just before the communion of the priest¹: "O Lord Jesus Christ, Who saidst to Thine Apostles, peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you: look not upon my sins, but upon the faith of Thy Church: and vouchsafe to her that peace and unity which is agreeable to Thy will: Who livest and reignest God world without end. Amen."

This prayer for the unity of the Church surely includes all the baptised Christians who are outside her visible and external unity, for they are yet her members and it was for them that Christ prayed!

This prayer for unity in the ancient Liturgies of the Church, used by Catholics and non-Catholics, by East and West, is of the utmost importance in the cause of Christian Reunion.

It is surely not for nothing that the Œcumenical Movement and the Liturgical Movement are commanding the attention of a large number of Christians to-day both among the ancient churches and those of Reformation origin.² Both scholars and Christian leaders, as well as the youth, are becoming aware of the value of the Liturgy in any attempt at bringing Christian bodies nearer to one another.

The scientific and historical study of the public and official prayer of the different Churches is the greatest aid in understanding the doctrinal teaching of these Churches respectively, both at the time of their origin and at the present day. In

¹ The Byzantine Liturgy also prays for unity:—

"For the peace of the world,
For the good estate of all the Holy Churches of God,
And for the unity of all let us pray to the Lord,
Kyrie Eleison."

² The Abbey of Maria Laach and the Priory of Amay are outstanding Catholic liturgical centres where Orthodox, Anglicans and Lutherans (both German and Scandinavian), etc., are frequent visitors.

these historic texts and their later developments and modifications one sees the different Christian bodies praying their faith. It is therefore essential for those working for Reunion to study and soak themselves in their own liturgical formulas¹ and in those of other Churches, both for a deepening of their faith and spiritual life as well as acquiring an intelligent knowledge of the authoritative prayer formulas of other denominations.

Liturgy, however, is not confined to the study of the texts of ancient manuscripts; it is not even only a source from which to obtain spiritual and doctrinal strength in order to feed our souls. Liturgy is life.² This is true of the Liturgy as the official prayer of the Catholic Church whether it be that of the Eastern or Western rites. To make this clear we will quote some passages from the recent book of Dom Wesseling referred to above:

"Mass is thus essentially Christ becoming present, and actively, truly, but sacramentally re-enacting the whole Redemption. (*Quoties huius hostiæ commemoratio celebratur, opus nostræ redemptionis exercetur. Secret, IX Sunday after Pentecost.*) At Mass Christ is born again, suffering again, dying again, rising again, triumphing again, all in one simple action, and through this action He is breathing a new impulse of vitality again into mankind and through mankind into the whole creation. If it is asked how this can be, the answer is that the Redeeming-Act is made present again, *not* with its historical details of time and space, but *sacramentally*, mystically. A sign can recall the past as easily as it can anticipate the future. A sacramental sign can bring about the past as it can anticipate the future. The historical, temporal, graphic aspect of the Incarnation is a bygone thing; as an immanent, vital, spiritual action, integral and essential part of the Redeeming-Act it has remained, and shares in the external actuality, the eternal living presence of Christ, the glorified Saviour."³

Having shown how the three constitutive factors of the Christian organism—Christ, priest and people—all take their share in the Mass, he goes on:

"At last we have reached the deepest unifying factor for our prospective: the Mass as centre, and all reality circling round that centre like the circles getting wider and vaguer

¹ It should be remembered that for Catholics who have the time and ability, the Eastern Liturgies as well as the Roman and less known Western Liturgies should be included in their studies. They are theirs by right.

² *vid. Liturgy and Life*, Dom Theodore Wesseling, Longmans, 1938.

³ *ibid. supra*, p. 26.

round the splash of a stone in water. We may now face the definition of Liturgy as the Common Act. The *Act* is Christ's Redeeming-Act centring in itself the whole human 'effort' and with it the 'movements' of all the rest of creation with which it is solidary. The Act, therefore, is eminently *Common*. Finally, this elaboration is primarily and mostly completely achieved in the highest of Sacraments: Holy Mass, and it is from the Mass outwards that the Common Act pervades reality; thus Liturgy defined as Common Act is principally realized in Mass and therefore belongs principally to Mass, and in a gradually wider (yet always strict) sense to the different levels of reality. Thus I think that the central idea of the Liturgy, the Common Act, and the central fact of the Liturgy, the Mass, gives us the best key to the understanding of the Meaning of the Liturgy."¹

Yet once again, in the last chapter dealing with the Liturgy as the *Sacramentum unitatis et pacis*, he applies this to man in relation to himself, to his fellow-men and in his relation with God, and of this last he says:—

"Liturgy derives all power from Christ, and its whole reason of existence is to achieve the union of all in all by Christ, with Christ, and in Christ. But the full meaning of Christ is not merely an individual meaning. The full meaning of Christ is the meaning of the *Christus Totus*, Christ as 'recapitulating,' as embracing in His own Mystery the whole of mankind, Christ as Head of the Mystical Body. Christ's new commandment was a commandment of love. . . . Here again Liturgy shows its relentless insistence on concrete reality. It is a fact inherent in our nature that we constitute one organism with our fellow-men. Therefore, for Liturgy, it is perfectly useless to make abstraction of one's fellow-men. If Christ united the first to the second commandment, it is the task of Liturgy to maintain and to foster this union of the two commandments. If Christ indissolubly welded the human to the Divine, it is the task and the honour of Liturgy to maintain and to defend the bonds of this mysterious marriage."²

Now that it is clear in what manner we are using the term Liturgy, we can examine how it is related to the problem of reunion; and first we will see if there are echoes of this doctrine among the non-Catholic churches.

Professor N. Arseniev (Russian Orthodox) expresses the same ideas as Dom Wesseling:

¹ *ibid.* p. 33.

² *ibid.* pp. 108, 109.

"A man cannot receive salvation as an isolated individual, he receives it in the great fellowship of his brothers. This standing of the Christian before God together with the brethren, this great new life which embraces all, which all are called to embrace, the great stream of the life of grace on which we are borne, this common growth within the vine, this union, this inner, organic union with Him the Head, and through Him with one another—this is the Church."¹

Again :

"The Liturgy is a piece of heavenly experience, of the heavenly present. At the same time it is rooted in history, lives its life out in historicity, and transfigures the concreteness of the creation, of nature, of men. It is the Presence of the suffering Lord, glorified and victorious in His sufferings."²

A recent Orthodox writer speaks of the effect of the Liturgy on the people as follows :

"We consider that the Liturgy, apart from its sacramental character, was a constant reminder of the evangelical tradition and of the humiliation and glorification of the Son of God. The Liturgy displays symbolically the history of redemption. The earthly life of the Lord is represented in the movements of the priest."³

We will now turn to some of the churches of the Reformation period.

Dr. Aulen, the Swedish Lutheran Bishop of Strängnäs, wrote a paper on the ministry and sacraments for the Edinburgh Conference of 1937. The following quotations are of interest :

"... salvation is a salvation of the whole man, realised through Christ's victory over sin and death and accomplished in the Resurrection. Salvation is God's way to man through the Incarnation; and the sacrament stands in immediate connection with the Incarnation, and in sharp contrast to the hellenistic idea of immanence." . . . "The Commemoration is a remembrance of the great *Sacrifice* that was made once on Calvary, when Divine Love suffered and gave itself for us. This sacrifice is here and now actualised and made visible and present in the Sacrament:" . . . "Now, in the act of commemoration we look back

¹ *We beheld His Glory*, Nicholas Arseniev (S.P.C.K., 1937). p. 137.

² *ibid.* p. 132.

³ *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought*. Nadejda Gorodetzky. (S.P.C.K. 1938). p. 96. And we would add still more *because* of its sacramental character.

to the historical events and the Sacrifice as we see them in the right light, in the light of the Resurrection. Therefore in celebrating the Lord's death we are not performing a funeral service, nor yet a mere memorial of a martyrdom; the Sacrament is not only a sacrament of suffering love, but also of victorious Love. We praise and magnify the living *Kyrios* Who comes to us in His holy Supper; Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."¹

We pass on to an extraordinary book first published in 1929, *A Free Church Book of Common Prayer*. It has, we are told, a rather wide circulation among the English Free Churches. In it the Eucharist (with the epiclesis) is given the central place in the worship of God. It also shows very strong influence of the Eastern Liturgies. This is from the prayer of oblation:

"Wherefore, O Lord, having in remembrance His blessed passion, His wondrous resurrection, and His glorious ascension, we Thy servants, together with all Thy people, do offer unto Thy most excellent Majesty, of Thine own gifts bestowed upon us, this pure, holy, and spotless Sacrifice, the Bread of eternal life and the Cup of everlasting salvation, giving thanks that Thou hast counted us worthy to stand before Thee."²

And last we will quote from Dr. Hicks, Anglican Bishop of Lincoln:

"His Body—the human nature which He came to redeem and to dedicate in the doing of God's Will—is offered in its perfect obedience, and transformed by the Spirit, in Resurrection, Ascension, and Session, into the body of His glory. . . . And, in the end, He gives His new manhood to His own in the gifts of His new Body and of His Blood which is His and their eternal life. . . ."

"There can, indeed, be no ultimate distinction between His glorified life and the life of redeemed humanity."³

¹ *vid. The Ministry and the Sacraments*, edited by Rev. R. Dunkerley. (S.C.M.P., London, 1937). pp. 161, 159, 160.

² Quoted in *We Beheld His Glory*, p. 101. Here are the equivalent prayers in the Roman and Byzantine Liturgies:

Roman Mass: "Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, and likewise Thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed Passion of the same Christ Thy Son, our Lord, together with His Resurrection from the grave, and also His glorious Ascension into heaven, offer, etc."

Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: "Remembering therefore this saving precept, and all these things that have been wrought for us, the Cross, the Tomb, the Resurrection after three days, the Ascension into heaven, the Session at the right hand, and second and glorious Coming again, we offer, etc."

³ *The Fullness of Sacrifice*. Bishop Hicks (1930). pp. 250, 337.

We do not quote more Anglicans as their liturgical tradition is well-known both on the side of scholarship commencing from the Oxford Movement and including their Incarnation theology, and the more recent movement of such men as Dom Gregory Dix and Father A. G. Herbert.

These few quotations we have made from quite divergent sources, show a real liturgical tendency and this tendency is often to be found among the same people who are interested in or who are members of the Œcumenical Movement. This being so, it seems to us that the way of the Liturgy is both the best and the most solid way of approaching the problem of reunion. Here at least we are at the heart of things. Through this channel the Holy Spirit can most surely work, for the Spirit of Christ will lead us unto all truth, and His truth will make us free.

Reunion work is perhaps too much hampered by the mentality that rejoices in large conferences and organizations, or by the mentality that thrives on novenas. Conferences, especially small study circles, are good in their way, all prayer is good too, but the mentality that we need to create is that of Christian "realism," the realization of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, of the share that all Christians should have in the Redeeming Act of Christ. This of course can only be completely realized within the visible unity of the Catholic Church, but this mentality is of the very soul of the Eastern Orthodox tradition and is at the back of what some term their individualistic asceticism. The Liturgy has in most cases not been scientifically studied (except recently), but the reality is there in the depths of the people and this is now being actualized in many quarters, e.g., among the exiled Russians and the *Zoë* movement in Greece.

In other churches in a greater or lesser degree, these ideas are taking root or being revived. Herein lies hope for the future.

This article is rather in the nature of a tentative introduction to maybe a series of articles (the subject is replete with expansion) or maybe it will provoke a number of letters. Let us at least pray, in the words of the Byzantine Liturgy :

"Asking for the unity of the Faith and for the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, let us commend ourselves and one another and all our life to Christ our God."

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

THE RUSSIAN CLERGY ON FREQUENT COMMUNION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

"It is good and beneficent to communicate every day, and to partake of the Holy Body and Blood of Christ. For He distinctly says: He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life" (St. John vi, 54).—St. Basil, Letter XCIII to the Patrician Caesaria concerning Communion.

THE Orthodox Church, like the Church of Rome, expects all her members to make their Easter communion. Even not very practising people would feel that to miss it means breaking away from the Church. Hence the crowds during the celebrations of Lent, and especially in Holy Week. But in the midst of these crowds one meets also devout people who have been present at all Sunday liturgies throughout the year. Many of them lived in expectation of Easter in order then to make their communion. Holy Week is a true feast for their souls. They fast and daily attend morning and evening services. The whole order of their daily life is sacrificed; their families respect this preparation for the great sacrament. One does not believe that one becomes "worthy" owing to the increase of devotion, but at least one has a hope of being ready to receive the holy meal with due reverence. Such an attitude prevails in the Orthodox world. A careful preparation before the reception of the "mysteries" is regarded as essential. Practising Orthodox would use it four or five times a year (Easter, Christmas, the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, the Assumption of our Lady and the day of their patron-saint). The Russians (with whom this paper is concerned) do not communicate without a previous confession or at least without an absolution: either personal or, in some particular cases, corporate. There is a custom of asking forgiveness of all the family or servants and, in cases of real offences, a person would go and reconcile himself with his offender or one offended by him. The evening before communion is usually spent in silence. This period of preparation, of confession and communion has in Russian a special word: *govenije*.

One can see at once that people used to such careful preparation would object to frequent communion, being afraid of "lightness," feeling that one can perhaps get used to it and forget "to discern the Lord's Body." Already St. Augustine had to reconcile the advocates and the opposers of frequent communion. St. John Chrysostom also knew

these objections and, however realistically he himself gave warning against unworthy communion, he nevertheless spoke against "special seasons" for communion. Forty days of preparation, according to him, are not an amendment for a year's coolness or sins. "Oh, the force of custom and prejudice! In vain is the daily Sacrifice, in vain do we stand before the altar; there is no one to partake."¹ The Church in her wisdom left the choice of way, with regard to the frequency of communion, to the conscience of each and to the discretion of spiritual directors. Nevertheless, she deplored the absence of communicants. And by the mouth of the same preacher she advised the Christians to respect the spiritual freedom of their brethren, whether they received communion frequently or abstained from it: "Paul," said St. John Chrysostom, "bids not one examine another, but a man himself, making the tribunal not a public one, and the conviction without a witness."²

This old question is still alive among the Russians. In many parishes of exile, the proportion of communicants is greater on any Sunday than would have happened in the pre-war Russia. There are in some parishes cases of weekly and, in some rare personal cases, of daily communion. But some among clergy and parishioners are still uneasy about it. Yet in Russia itself, the nineteenth century ecclesiastical world felt keenly the need of a more intense liturgical life. This conviction grew alongside with the advance of the century—in the same way as the liturgical revival of the West. It was not a case of influence: we dare believe that the awakening of liturgical devotion in all Christendom is due to the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit.

Let us begin the illustration of Russian thought on frequent communion with the writings of an eighteenth century bishop. His works were included in the programmes of ecclesiastical schools, so that the nineteenth century clergy certainly knew them; moreover, the bishop was canonized in 1861.

Tikhon, Bishop of Voronezh (1724—1783) spoke often of holy communion. He avoided any theoretical dissertations on the subject, and appealed directly to faith. "Concerning the mystery of the Holy Trinity, of the most Holy Eucharist and other mysteries; also concerning what is not revealed in the Holy Word of God, and what is revealed but cannot be understood, seek not in curiosity. Believe according to the

¹ St. John Chrysostom, *Homily on Ephesians*, III; in ed. Pusey, *A Library of Fathers*, Oxford 1842, p. 131.

² St. John Chrysostom, *Homily XXVIII on 1 Cor.* xi, 28; in ed. Pusey, p. 383.

Church.”¹ On the other hand, in this as in all other respects, he began with the education of the clergy. In his most inspiring *Exhortations to the clergy*, he teaches a priest how to prepare for the celebration of the Liturgy. We must mention here that in the Byzantine Liturgy, besides the divine commandment of the words of institution, there is another moment when the congregation is earnestly exhorted to make their communion. The priest comes out from the altar lifting the chalice and saying “with the fear of God, with faith and love draw near.” Bishop Tikhon and many others felt that these words and all the prayers of thanksgiving which follow become a formality unless there is a real response to them from the faithful. So, instructing his clergy, the Bishop says: “When you pronounce ‘with fear and faith draw near’ think how Christ appeared after His resurrection to His Apostles and to all the brethren. Also know that by these words you call the faithful to participate in these Holy Mysteries. And when you see that no one approaches, suffer in your heart that Christ should call all to Him and offer the meal of His most Holy Body and Blood, yet that nobody should come to the supper of such a benefactor.”²

He believed firmly that the spiritual fire kindled in men by the Holy Ghost is increased and strengthened through reading or listening to the Word of God, through prayer and meditation, and holy communion. He classified this last among the duties of a Christian towards himself. He taught the use of confession before participation in the Lord’s Body and desired to see the fruits of Penance and communion in the fuller growth of a soul. In fact, he believed that communion, if duly received, will produce in a soul constant remembrance of divine mercies, an amazement of joy and awe, and the spirit of thanksgiving which alone would be enough to “decline you from all sin and to move you towards all good.”³

But as we examine here chiefly the question of the frequency of communion, we cannot dwell on Bishop Tikhon’s general thoughts on this sacrament. We must only point out that, while he advised the clergy “to suffer in their heart” when there were no communicants, he reminded the congregation of the use of frequent communion in the early Church. “The Christians of old often received the Holy Mysteries, as food of eternity. From then until now the holy Church calls daily: ‘with fear of God, with faith and love draw near.’

¹ Tikhon, Bishop of Voronezh (Sokolov) *Works*, 2nd ed., Moscow 1860. 15 tt.; t. 1, p. 129. The author of this paper is preparing a book on St. Tikhon.

² Ibid., t. 1, p. 27.

³ Ibid., t. 14, Letter, On the first Christian deed, p. 36.

But there is nothing like this among the people to-day, as practice itself shows. Once in a year, and then almost by compulsion, they approach this immortal meal; many put it off until they are ill, some almost until their death. A thing worthy of pity! People joyfully hurry to banquets; but to this spiritual and most holy meal to which Christ calls us, they go almost under constraint"¹; this sorrowful reproach will be repeated by others.

The great hermit of Sarov, Seraphim (1759—1823, canonized in 1903) left no writings. From his cell in the wood he used to come on Sundays and feast-days and receive his communion in the church of his monastery. When, owing to illness, he had to live again in his monastery but did not go out of his cell and kept complete silence for many years, the sacrament was brought into his cell. There is a striking case, when he recommended a daily communion to one of the nuns of Diveyevo, overgrieved with a sacrificial, saintly, sudden death of her sister. The nun was to receive communion daily "until the requiem of the fortieth day."²

The author of the *Catechism*, one of the great ecclesiastical figures of the Russian nineteenth century, Filaret (Drozdov, Metropolitan of Moscow, 1782—1867), was reputed as a preacher, and expressed his theological thought chiefly in his sermons. His listeners could learn from his sermons the Orthodox approach to main Christian dogmas. But in vain would one seek there any reference to frequent communion; nor would we find it in the *Catechism*. It mentions the ancient use of weekly communion and points out that every Christian is advised to partake of it four times a year, and obliged to partake of it once a year. But we read in one of Filaret's letters: "The present disordered epoch gives one a thorough reason to receive Holy Communion more frequently; it is necessary to preserve in one's soul a humble and affectionate desire of communion with the Lord."³

We must remember that the use of daily communion was not spread among the clergy themselves. They only had recourse to it in case of illness and of approaching death. So we learn of another Filaret (Amfitheatrov, Metropolitan of Kiev, 1779—1857) that "preparing himself for his death, during forty months and twenty-one days he daily received his communion."⁴

¹ Ibid., t. 6, p. 303, On true Christianity.

² In English. A. F. Dobbie-Bateman, *St. Seraphim of Sarov*, S.P.C.K., 1936, pp. 61; p. 22.

³ *Report of the Imperial Public Library for 1888*, St. Petersburg, 1891; *Letters of the Metropolitan Filaret*, Letter 41 to Mme. Naumova, p. 50.

⁴ T. I. Barsov. *The Holy Synod*, St. Petersburg 1896, pp. iv, 446; p. 400; from the report to the Emperor Alexander II by the Prince Vassilchikov.

It is worth while noticing that in a book of *Selected Sermons of twelve Hierarchs of the Russian Church*, we find two references to frequent communion. Michael (Desnitzky), Metropolitan of St. Petersburg († 1824), put before his congregation the example of the early Christians and exhorted them not to avoid communion under the pretext of personal unworthiness. "Brethren, let us strive to imitate their faith, zeal and love."¹ Years before, when he was still a parish priest, he read in the church, during Lent, the writings of Tikhon of Voronezh on the Sacraments and others. In the same volume, the third Filaret of this period (Gumilevsky, Archbishop of Chernigov, 1805—1866) taught that we could help the departed through the celebration of the sacrament of eucharist.²

Little is left in the way of sermons by the ecclesiastical historian, Bishop Innokenty of Penza and Saratov (Smirnov, 1784—1819). He died early, a victim of his hard work. But we know from his biographer that he himself celebrated with such zeal and concentration that he did not even notice the alarm once aroused during the service by a fire which had caught his own house. In a sermon on the Sunday of St. Thomas he spoke of the experience of a Christian who recognizes his Lord in the Blessed Sacrament as the Apostle who cried out: "My Lord and my God."³ In his letters he speaks often of the Eucharist. He certainly must have been an advocate of frequent communion—if only because he was an admirer of Bishop Tikhon. The Princess Sophie Meschersky (wife of Prince Ivan and sister-in-law of Prince Peter, once the procurator of the Holy Synod) was his friend; she edited, with his approval, the select works of Tikhon. In his correspondence with the Princess, Innokenty writes: "You are preparing for confession. . . . Remember, that He will be present in the mystery of communion, He will enter you when you receive His dearest Body and Blood. Remember this and desire, desire more frequently and more strongly, deeper and longer, with more fire and faithfulness, and remembering, pray; and praying hope for this true visitation of His, heavenly, divine, incomprehensible."⁴ Let us notice that these letters to the Princess are dated November, December and January of the years 1817 to 1819 (year of his death). Some have no date. But we can conclude that the Princess was preparing for a communion which was not the

¹ *Select Sermons of the twelve Hierarchs of the Russian Church*. Moscow 1861, p. 214.

² *Ibid.*, p. 354.

³ Innokenty Smirnov, *Works*, ed. 1821, pp. xxxvi, 335; p. 183.

⁴ Innokenty Smirnov, *Letters to the Princess S. S. Meschersky*, Moscow 1875, pp. 77; p. 4, letter 3 from 30th November, 1817.

pascal one, which means that she received it at least twice a year, and, we are allowed to suppose, more.

It is of interest to see what a very celebrated preacher of this period and the writer of some widely read religious books (*The last days of the earthly life of Our Lord*, and others) had to say on the frequent use of the sacrament. Innokenty (Borisov, the Archbishop of Kherson, 1800—1857) devoted many of his sermons to the preparation of a communicant. Many of them were translated into French and published by his admirer, Alexandre de Stourdza (*Homélies à l'usage de ceux qui se préparent à la pénitence et à la Sainte communion prononcées à Kiev*, par le R. P. Recteur Innocent, aujourd'hui archevêque de Karcov, Paris 1846). More is said in them on confession than on communion. It is true, the author says that fasting and all the ascetical efforts are probably wrong if a man did not "feel a spiritual hunger for the divine meal."¹ On another occasion (unfortunately, no dates are given) he speaks of the practice of frequent communion in the early Church but he does not exhort his listeners to imitate this example.² Moreover, he warns those who would imagine that their spiritual healing would be reached by the use of frequent communion. No, he says, approaching here St. John Chrysostom: but it depends on the spirit with which we partake of the sacrament. Nevertheless, a pure and prayerful life is, as it were, a demand of the Body and Blood of Christ. No one can claim to live without it.³ He further on insists that the faithful should not try to spare the time and effort of the priests, that they should come at any time if they wanted "explanation, or comfort, or prayer and another confession."⁴ Now, as a communion in Russia was never approached without a confession, so confession also meant (cases of penance excepted) another communion. Speaking once more of the practice of the ancient Church, he tried to explain the loss of this practice. "The consciousness of one's impurity and unworthiness, and the desire to be better prepared for this great Sacrament, led to the custom of communicating not always but at some definite days and times. But this use must in no way serve as an excuse for our laziness." Must one take seriously or as mere rhetoric the words which follow and in which he complains that "if one offered manna, all would come." Now, the Church offers daily the Body and Blood of Christ, and nobody comes to

¹ Innokenty Borisov, *Works*, 12 tt., ed. Wolf, Moscow and St. Petersburg 1901, t. 9, p. 71.

² *Ibid.*, p. 97.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 140; in the French edition, p. 183.

receive them. Is it a good sign? Is it health of soul, to turn from spiritual food? Supposing some had no time to prepare themselves; but if no one comes to receive the bread of heaven, it means that nobody is worthy; now if no one is worthy, what shall we say of our Christianity? What would a king say of some courtier who, having been invited daily to his table, would come there only once a year?"¹ But he then points out that there are four seasons of fasting in the Church, thus in a way bringing to nothing his own sermon. Now, as he advised for his listeners among other Lenten reading the works of Bishop Tikhon, they could find there a more convincing call to approach the Holy Table more frequently.

The successor of Filaret in the see of Moscow, formerly a missionary in Alaska, Innokenty (Popov *alias* Veniaminov, 1797—1879) is of greatest interest to us. During his missionary journeys, he suffered in seeing that the new converts remained often without the support of the sacraments, owing not so much to the absence of the clergy as to the absence of church-buildings. He was most eager to build small chapels everywhere so as to make communion accessible to the native Christians. He insisted that the Liturgy should be celebrated everywhere, in a tent or in the open air, and many times applied to the Synod asking for permission and the gift of the antimimension (corporal) to the travelling missionaries.² In some cases he himself gave the antimimension to his clergy, without waiting for an answer from the Synod.³ After his second missionary tour, he believed that the Tungus became stronger in their faith owing to communion.⁴

In a sermon on Christmas day 1827, he spoke most movingly of the self-humiliation of the incarnate Christ. He reminded his hearers of the wise men who worshipped, as divine, a poor and weak baby—must not we likewise worship the Body and Blood of Christ in His Sacrament of the altar?

Again—still a parish priest—in 1828 he addressed his flock: "Thus each one who desires his eternal salvation, must be repentent for his sins not only in the appointed time of Lent; but at all times he should communicate of the holy

¹ Ibid., p. 172—173.

² The antimimension is a cloth with the representation on it of the burial of Christ in the tomb and of the Evangelists. Relics of the saints are sewn into it. It is a reminder of the celebrations in the catacombs, on the tombs of martyrs, and is indispensable for the celebration of the Eucharist, which may be celebrated upon the antimimension alone if there is no consecrated church.

³ *Works of Innokenty*, edited by I. P. Barsukov, 3 tt., Moscow 1888; Vol. II consecrated to the description of his life. See pp. 137, 140, 144, 149, 160.

⁴ Ibid., p. 249.

Body and Blood of Christ. The Christians of the primitive Church endeavoured to accomplish this duty, and there was no celebration without communicants; and most especially they regarded it as their bounden duty to do it every year on the holy Easter day, Christmas day, on the feast of the apostles Peter and Paul and on the Assumption."¹

He devoted many sermons to the explanation of the life within us of the Holy Ghost. Given to us through Baptism, the Holy Spirit renews us through Penance as a second Baptism, while Holy Communion is the beginning of our sanctification.² The ways to receive the Holy Spirit are: purity of heart and chastity; humility, listening to the voice of God; prayer; daily self-negation; reading and listening to the Holy Scriptures; the Sacraments of the Church, and especially Holy Communion.³

He notices that through union with Christ in holy communion a Christian becomes the dwelling of the Blessed Trinity. He points out the social, corporate implications of this: "The Christians of early times, feeling the importance and spiritual use of the Holy Mysteries, received the Body and Blood of Christ every Sunday and every feast-day. Therefore there was in them, as it is said in the book of the Acts of the Apostles, one heart and one soul. But, O my Lord, what a difference between them and ourselves! How many are those among us who have not communicated for many years running. How many never think of it. For the sake of God, have the desire to receive Holy Communion . . . and he who does not want it, does not love Jesus Christ."⁴

In his special addresses to those preparing for confession and communion (no date given) Innokenty spoke again of communion as a pledge of sanctification, an eternal drink quenching the thirst of our souls. "Christ left us His Holy Communion which we can receive every time that we only desire it and need it."⁵ "What a treasure we have in our hands: indeed in our own hands because no one forbids us to approach and to drink from this cup of life: whenever you want it, come. And not only does nobody forbid it, but daily the Church calls us to this immortal chalice—'draw near,' she cries: 'receive the Body of Christ, test of the source immortal.'"

¹ *Works*, t. I, p. 43.

² *Ibid.*, p. 112.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 213 (from the *Indication of the way into the Kingdom of Heaven*). This booklet was composed in 1833 in Aleutian language; between 1839—1885 there were 46 editions of it in Russian.

⁴ *Ibid.*, t. I, p. 225 (*Indication of the Way*, etc.).

⁵ *Fourth address*, p. 132.

It is harmful negligence not to respond to this call of the Church. It is wrong to withstand because of personal unworthiness. None is ever worthy to be united with Christ, and this was felt by all the saints, by St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom. "But if one is to be judged so severely, Jesus Christ would not leave to us this sacrosanct gift; but He instituted it so that we sinners might have visible holy things, for our purification and sanctification. . . . No! the one who pleads inability does so not because he regards himself as unworthy, but because he does not feel an inward desire, he is not tormented by an inward spiritual thirst. . . . He is in a very dangerous condition, he is in a deadly illness of soul"; and the preacher continued to exhort his listeners not to refuse the sacrament: for "this is fearful." He assures them that the early Christians could live as good and real Christians just because they partook often of communion. He asks those who do not feel the need of a frequent communion to stir in themselves the desire of it.¹

It is often objected in the Orthodox world that it would not be possible to approach the holy sacrament without fasting before. (Not of course in the sense of abstinence from food the very morning of the communion which would not be too difficult, but in the sense of observance during a week, as in Lent, which might be impossible in daily life.) To this also Innokenty objects that a keeping of Lent or fast is not a formal thing, and there were examples when monks, even future canonized saints, used to eat meat and yet to receive their communion without blame. "Apart from enmity and malice nothing forbids us to partake of the Holy communion."²

Unfortunately, all priests did not hold this opinion. A tragic illustration of it is in the case of the young pupil of St. Petersburg Engineering School, Bryanchaninov, later on Ignaty, Bishop of Caucasus (1806—1867). He felt early a call to religious life and expressed it in that "he began to go to confession every Saturday and to communicate each Sunday";³ he also persuaded to follow him one of his best friends who later on also became a monk. But the priest of this military school, used to a formal confession of the pupils once a year, was alarmed. He reported to the director of the school and the young men had to give explanations of their zeal. Bryanchaninov fell ill, and, according to the witness of his friend, never completely recovered after this shock. Is it surprising that later on, monk and priest, he recommended in his correspondence to be very careful in the choice of the

¹ Ibid., pp. 132—137.

² Ibid., pp. 132—137.

³ L. Sokolov, Bishop Ignaty. Kiev 1915, 2 tt.; t. 1, pp. 64, 65.

confessor, or that he avoided giving any definition with regard to frequent communion? He often wrote on the Eucharist and gave advice, in a strong yet vague form, to approach it "as often as possible." He also guided his friends and spiritual children to the reading of the works of Tikhon of Voronezh. This and the practice of his young days allow us to conclude that he would probably advocate a weekly communion.

The notion "Liturgical Revival" was not used in Russia in the period studied here, but in fact it already began to come to life, and it is closely connected with the parish priest of Cronstadt, John Sergiev (1829—1908). He had links with one of the monasteries where Bishop Ignaty had lived for some time, and he knew the latter's disciples. Father John was widely renowned for his gift of healing, his charity and prayer. Thousands of people gathered to see or hear him. He had hardly any time to sleep, and he used to say that he drew strength for his ministry from the Eucharist alone. Since the day of his ordination, he daily celebrated the Liturgy. And he explained the love of people for himself by his daily communion.¹

There was such power of conviction and persuasion when he came out with the chalice pronouncing the liturgical call to the faithful, that people could not resist it. Someone who had not received communion for many years began "to draw near" and suddenly remembered that he was not prepared, had not been to confession for years.² Father John introduced corporate confession because he had literally no more time for individual ones, except difficult cases. communion in his church lasted sometimes for two hours.³

In his pastoral practice he was not afraid to recommend the sacrament as a means in the struggle with evil. So, to a repentant drunkard, he said: "If you feel this struggle is too hard for you, run to your spiritual father and beg him to give you Holy Communion. This is a great and powerful weapon in the fight against drink. Do not be ashamed to call your sin by its true name before the priest; do not hide it in your soul. The Orthodox Church does not refuse the holy sacrament to any of her sons, and the Liturgy is celebrated daily."⁴

Father John had the feeling of the Church as the Body of Christ strongly. He therefore called the faithful not to a

¹ Hieromonk Mikhail, *Father John Sergiev of Cronstadt*. St Petersburg 1903, pp. 398, p. 108; cf. A. Krotkov, *On Cronstadt's protopriest John*, Moscow 1903, pp. 43; p. 15.

² Mikhail, *ib.*, p. 109.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 114—116.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 291.

good life but to the supernatural life. "The Church contains the true food for our souls: the Word of God, the Sacraments, the services or readings, the singing and the sacred rites nourishing both intelligence and feeling. Come more often and partake of incorruption by your mind, heart and mouth."¹

He knew the sadness of the churches without communicants. This holy sorrow tormented him. "A church building is for a Christian the centre of light, grace, peace, of divine life, of sanctification and sanctity, of spiritual and bodily renewal, of strength and spiritual wisdom"; constantly, all men are appealed to; rebirth is possible to all. The divine gifts are offered—but there are none or there are few receivers.² He knew that man is often unprepared, indeed unworthy to live by the Liturgy, yet even such a one is spiritualised, is "divinised" by it. "But," he added, "there are men for whom the Liturgy is everything in this world."³

What would the world become without the sacrifice of Christ, daily remembered on the altars? It would lack true life, "it would be only a phantom of life."⁴

He uttered words of prophetic power. Christians grew indifferent to the grace of the Liturgy. They were cold and inattentive during the services. They seldom partook of holy communion, and this almost out of custom, once a year. "They deprive themselves of the invaluable treasure. That is why there is no true life in the Orthodox Christians—life according to the spirit of Christ. That is why vices and disasters increase. That is why all creation is armed against us as if revenging the enemies of God—all the elements: water, fire and air, and death in all forms."⁵

He called if not to a frequent communion, at least to a frequent and reverent attendance of the Liturgy. He exhorted the sick to approach the healing Christ in His supper. He would hardly believe that people who could find time did not come to partake of the immortal source. Sinners did not seek a relief from their burden. Only unconscious children were brought to communion, and even these were often carried not by their mothers but by "hired nannies."⁶

For him, the Liturgy was the best test of our spiritual state: are we alive or dead, and what sort of passions do we harbour, what sort of diseases? "O, with what care must

¹ John Sergiev, *Works*, 6 tt., St. Petersburg 1894; t. 6, p. 18. His diary in English exists; *My Life in Christ*, Cassell & Co. 1897 and select works, A. B. Mowbray, Oxford 1899 and J. Murray, 1901.

² *Ibid.*, t. 6, p. 54.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

⁶ *Ibid.*, t. 1, pp. 350—352.

one always prepare for this heavenly, awful, lifegiving Mystery, for this universal sacrifice, sacrifice of those of heaven, of earth, and of those under the earth."¹

Perhaps the best way to sum up this paper and the preaching of Father John is to quote his sermon on the day when the relics of Bishop Tikhon of Voronezh, himself, as the reader knows already, an advocate of frequent communion, were exposed for veneration.

Father John exhorted his listeners to imitate the new saint. "We all," he said, "are holy with the holiness of Christ" when we partake of His Body and Blood. "Therefore let each communicate more often, communicate worthily; and often you will bring back the sanctity you constantly lose, you will often renew your nature corrupted by sin, and little by little you will become holy by your disposition, awakened and sustained by the grace of Christ." Because such is not the enviable lot of the apostles alone or of some elect ones, "but of all of us" (1 Thessalon. iv, 7). "You see now, we all can and must become holy saints."²

This is in no way an exhaustive research. But even these fragments give some idea of the desire of the Russian clergy to stir up the liturgical life of their flock.³

NADEJDA GORODETZKY.

¹ Ibid., t. 6, p. 88.

² Ibid., t. 3, p. 114.

³ There were interesting recent writings of the late Professor of Petrograd Ecclesiastical Academy, Protopriest O. Nalimov; he advocated frequent Communion, but as he more particularly dwelt on communion as related to the discipline of confession, this would demand a separate study.

AMONGST THE ARMENIANS IN JERUSALEM

Editor's Note. The author of this article shows himself observant and at the same time very outspoken in his comment of what he has seen. After reading this, perhaps one might be allowed to conclude that not only is latinization among Catholics of the Oriental rites a thing to be fought against but that a system of education for the Catholic Oriental clergy ought to be found which while it equips them as well as the European priests does not at the same time destroy the peculiar tradition of the Christian East that should be theirs: this is certainly achieved by those of the dissident clergy who have studied in Europe.

What the author says of the latinized Catholic Armenian church in Jerusalem can be paralleled by the Catholic Armenian cathedral at Cairo.

ON Mount Sion in the centre of the Armenian quarter stands the Patriarchal Church of St. James. It is very ancient, said to have been given to the Armenians by the king of Spain when the whole people were in communion with the Pope and Western Christendom. It has a charm peculiar to itself which must awaken interest in the most casual visitor. This is owing to its entirely oriental character. There is nothing to be found here to offend the eye and it is furnished in exquisite taste. Ancient and mellowed paintings adorn the walls, otherwise covered with blue tiles oriental in workmanship and design. Rush matting and lovely Eastern carpets are on the floor for the use of worshippers, no pews or benches are to be seen. No unsightly plaster statues can shock your artistic sense. Everything is ancient and of the best oriental' craftsmanship. The air is sweet with the smell of incense, and the whole atmosphere is in keeping with the purpose of this famous shrine of the Christian East.

"And at the same time, Herod the king stretched forth his hands, to afflict some of the church. And he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword." (Acts xii, 1.) The martyrdom of St. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem is localized in a charming little chapel leading off the spacious central church. Until 1870 the Franciscan Fathers had permission to celebrate the Holy Mysteries here, since that date the practice has been discontinued. It is a place of pilgrimage for all Christians, who can avail themselves at the same time of the opportunity of visiting this beautiful cathedral and the exquisitely furnished chapels leading off the main building.

Should one happen to visit this church during the celebration of the Holy Liturgy, it is an experience that is not easily forgotten. You can take part in the central act of Christian worship according to the Armenian rite. The Liturgy is largely that of St. John Chrysostom with certain

modifications taken from the Roman rite which were introduced during the time when they were in union with Rome. In this church the Liturgy is celebrated with extraordinary beauty. The vestments of the clergy and their assistants are of ancient oriental workmanship and are really gorgeous. The chant which is rendered by the seminarians is exceptionally good. Delightful as is this music when rendered by a rough untrained choir, provided of course that the singers are orientals, it becomes perfectly lovely when sung by the carefully trained singers at Jerusalem. The altar vessels, candlesticks, censers, etc., are all of local workmanship. Everything even to the smallest liturgical object is intrinsically oriental in style and manufacture.

Around the church are clustered many ancient buildings which serve as offices for the patriarchate, schools, and accommodation for the clergy who serve the patriarchal church, the Holy Sepulchre, the Tomb of the Blessed Virgin and the other holy places in Jerusalem where the Armenian Liturgy is celebrated. All the clergy are monks, there are no married clergy. There is also close to the Patriarch's residence a seminary for the formation of aspirants to the priesthood, a convent of nuns and a number of pleasant gardens. In the quarter on Mount Sion some two hundred Armenian families are to be found.

On the Via Dolorosa at the Fourth Station is the Armenian Catholic church of Our Lady of the Fright. It is a large modern building with a dome in Italian style. There is a crypt under which some interesting and very old mosaics have recently been unearthed, which prove that the site was considered authentic at an early date.

On entering the church I was surprised to see a holy water stoup and a large statue of St. Anthony of Padua. Neither of these is tolerated in the Armenian rite and their presence is very incongruous. Rather tawdry and cheap looking Stations of the Cross are on the walls, and in the place of the distinctive altar of their rite they have placed a large one of Roman pattern as the principal altar in the church. One Sunday I attended the only Liturgy. The priest celebrated in vestments more like those of the Latin rite than of the Armenian. He celebrated in an undertone, using what I suppose must have been the Armenian Liturgy or some parts of it. It was an imitation of Low Mass. While this was going on, some children, grouped round a man whom I imagined to be a Sunday School teacher, recited the Dominican rosary and sang hymns very indifferently. The clergy are attired when out of doors in the costume that one associates with French priests. After the worship-

ful fittingness of the patriarchal church to find this mixture of rites in the Catholic Armenian church was rather a shock.

I got into conversation with an old weather-beaten Armenian who had come to Jerusalem to end his days in prayer and visiting the Holy Places. The quiet dignity of this old man was impressive, I might have been speaking to some warrior of the Kings of Armenia in the ancient days when this kingdom was a great centre of Christianity. "I am a Catholic," he said with emphasis on the word, "but I always go to the Latin church. I prefer to confess to European priests, our own Catholic Armenian priests are pious men but simple. Europeans can advise me better. Our priests try to be the same as Europeans, but they are not." Questioned as to the possibility of reunion with Rome of the whole Armenian nation, he shrugged his shoulders and said that he thought that perhaps European priests might be able to do something, otherwise there was little hope. And when I mentioned the rite, to my surprise he answered, "Our Holy Liturgy, that is everything to an Armenian," and with tears in his eyes he added, "I always go to St. James's on our national festivals."

I visited an Armenian resident in Jerusalem who devotes all his time to work in the cause of his people. He speaks excellent English, having lived for many years in the United States. He is a member of the Gregorian dissident Church.

"What do you think of the possibility of reunion with Rome?" I asked.

"I am altogether averse to any movement in that direction," he replied. "I will be quite frank with you, I think that there is very little difference between my religion and yours, and I do not base my objection upon those grounds. It does not matter to me whether we have the Pope for the head of our Church or not. But as matters now stand, when an Armenian becomes a Catholic it is very probable that after three generations his children will no longer be Armenians. If we join with you we shall weaken our nationality and in time we shall cease to exist."

"But surely the papal pronouncements are quite definite upon the point. Rome desires you to become Catholics, keeping your rite in all its purity," I objected.

"That is so, and many Armenian Catholics are good Armenians, but they become latinized and in the end will become absorbed by the Latin nations. There is not the same danger with the Protestants. Of recent years they have made great advance amongst us both in Armenia and in our communities all over the world. They open excellent schools and institutions and we have much to thank them for. I am not attracted to Protestantism, our religion is much the same

as Catholicism. Many of our people, however, become Protestants but they are not lost to our nation. It is inevitable for the time being that we should be on good terms with them. As you know, the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem assists at our Easter ceremonies attired in the vestments of an Armenian bishop!"¹

The crowded congregations and the reverent behaviour of these people, when assisting at the offices in church, show them to be more than externally religious. The Catholics furnish a great number of vocations, both men and women. These enter the various Latin religious orders,² unfortunately sacrificing their rite in so doing. It is only natural that this religious spirit should find a prominent place in their national sentiments, theirs is a small Christian nation between the two great Muslim powers, Turkey and Persia. The national sentiment of this people is sanctified by their passionate attachment to Christ.

The little mountain land to which this people, scattered all over the world, look with such affection is to-day divided into three parts between their two Mohammedan neighbours and Soviet Russia. In this last part the practice of the Christian religion is almost unknown, but the national language and culture not only survives but is encouraged. Thither flock Armenian pilgrims from all over the world.

The people of Haikim throughout the centuries, and in many lands often in poverty and hunger, cling fast to the eternal ideal of the resurrection of their mountain fatherland as an integrally Christian nation. Down the ages numberless pilgrims must have prayed for this in Jerusalem.

A BRITISH RESIDENT.

¹ Surely this is a mistake. In cope and mitre yes, as most Anglican bishops wear these days.—*Editor*.

² In spite of the fact of Catholic religious orders of the Armenian rite, e.g., the Mekhitarists.—*Editor*.

THE ARMENIAN LITURGY

I.

ORIGIN OF THE LITURGY.

WHATEVER may be the authenticity of the visit and martyrdom of the Apostles St. Bartholomew and St. Thaddeus in Armenia, it seems certain that Christianity must have penetrated very early indeed. Legends such as the history of the King Abgar offering to receive our Lord in his country upon hearing that the Jews persecuted Him, appear much later than one would expect were there any truth in the matter. At any rate, just as there were Christians in England centuries before the advent of St. Augustine, the nucleus of the Church in Armenia existed considerably earlier than St. Gregory the Illuminator in the third century, who is venerated both historically and in the Liturgy as the official founder of Christianity in Armenia. There is no doubt that St. Gregory received his commission from Rome, and the Armenians thereby recognized not only a definite notion of the supremacy of the Church of Caesaria, where St. Gregory was consecrated, but a vague belief in the primacy of Rome. Owing however to exceptionally strong national feeling, due perhaps to the great number of persecutions they had to undergo, this filial allegiance to Rome, with which there was very little intercourse, could not last for long. The Council of Chalcedon (451) was unfortunately never attended by the Armenian Church owing to war with Persia; in fact, at the time very little thought must have been given to the council itself. The consequences, however, proved to be a great stumbling block

Sources of reference chiefly consulted :

Liturgies Eastern and Western. Brightman. Oxford. 1896.

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie. Cabrol and Leclercq. Paris.

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. Vacant. Paris. Tome I, article on "Arménie."

The Church of Armenia. Mgr. Ormanian. English translation by M. Gregory. London. 1912.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Hastings.

Dissident Armenian *Prayer Book* containing the Order of the Liturgy and most of the Office. Published at Constantinople. 1895.

Dissident Armenian *Prayer Book* containing the Order of the Liturgy and most of the Office. Published at Athens. 1924.

Denzinger Bannwart's *Enchiridion Sybolorum.* 532 sqq., 695 sqq., 3008, 3024.

Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio. Renandot.

Catholic Eastern Churches. D. Attwater. 1935.

Dissident Eastern Churches. D. Attwater. 1937.

Armenian Church. E. F. K. Fortescue. London. 1872.

Missa Armenica (Catholic). Prince Max of Saxony. Ratisbon. 1908.

for the Armenian Church, which formally rejected Chalcedon in 491. In 571 there was a temporary union with the Church at Constantinople as a result of the Armenians being driven westward by the Persians. This gives us an example of the character of the Armenians who, while maintaining the integrity of the national Church and tongue, submitted themselves to the Greeks and then again rejected this principle according to what best suited them politically.

It should be mentioned that St. Gregory introduced the early form of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom—probably the anaphora of St. Basil. The earliest Armenian writings on this subject appear to be Syriac in origin; the Creed, for instance, is almost identical with the Syriac pseudo-Athanasian text. It should be added here that Latin infiltrations are few in number and of little importance; the identity of the Liturgy is maintained. It seems but natural that an essentially nomad race, upon first coming into direct contact with fellow Christians from the West during the Crusades, should copy a few of the apparently most attractive characteristics and should add them to their own Liturgy; though there is little excuse for them to claim immemorial antiquity for such ceremonies as the reciting of the psalm “Judica me, Deus . . .,” and the “Last Gospel” and the bishop’s use of the mitre of the western type. The use of unleavened bread for the Sacrifice and the antidoron is, however, very much older; it was probably to signify mystically the Monophysite doctrine, as well as to show a distinction from the Syrians. The wafer is, however, somewhat thicker than that used in the Latin rite to-day, and the antidoron can best be described as being “in shreds.”

There is practically no “development” of the Liturgy, and on this account the Armenians are certainly to be praised, for in spite of appalling difficulties, they have managed to retain their ecclesiastical identity, to which they cling so firmly.

At this point it would not be out of place to say a few words about the church building itself. Usually rather circular in shape, the interior is quite plain as regards decoration, all the artistic beauty being centred round the altar before which a simple curtain replaces the Byzantine eikonostasis. The altar faces east. Though originally the sexes were separated, this custom is no longer followed in European countries. The altar stands on an elevated platform; the choir take their place on a lower level, outside the curtain. There is but one Liturgy a day in each church and, as the Armenians do not concelebrate—the dissidents rarely celebrate on other days than Sundays, as even the greater feasts are now transferred to the nearest Sunday—many weeks may intervene before the same priest

celebrates again in places where many reside together. The notion of the daily Sacrifice seems utterly foreign to them. The small shrines or what appear to the western eye as side-altars are merely for decorative purposes, though occasionally one meets an example of a special "titular" altar where the Liturgy is celebrated only on some feast day. Where the faithful are so numerous that more than one celebration is required on the same day, the Liturgy is actually offered by another priest on a "side-altar," but this is said then to count as a separate church, although the distinction is purely fictitious. The high altar itself usually has a reredos of a picture of the Virgin and Child. At appropriate seasons this may be replaced by a picture of the Crucifixion or by one of Christ in glory at the Transfiguration, a feast which is very solemnly celebrated, as will be seen in the section dealing with the Office and calendar.

The altar is surmounted by a canopy with all the sides open except the back which is formed by the reredos. There seems to be no definite rule regarding the number of candles; twelve to twenty are quite usual, with flowers in between, like the setting for an exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in the Latin rite.

VESTMENTS.

There is almost no distinction between the vestments of the Byzantine and Armenian rites. For the celebration of the Liturgy, the priest first puts on the *shabig* (lit. "shirt") which corresponds to the alb and is usually of silk and somewhat fuller. The stole is similar to the Byzantine style, namely, the front is hemmed together and the head is "put through"; it may be studded with jewels. To the girdle is attached on the left side a large white linen napkin, answering to the purificator. Then, the cuffs to bind the sleeves of the alb follow; as for so many other ceremonies, a mystical significance is attached to this, namely that these represent the bands which fastened our Lord during the Passion.

Subsequently, the *varkass* is put on; this is a type of amice with a stiffened collar attached and standing up round the neck, sufficiently high to appear above the cope. It is very similar to the apparelled amice worn in the west. E. F. K. Fortescue in *The Armenian Church* adds there that higher ecclesiastics wear also a breastplate of metal—even silver or gold—studded with jewels and adorned with figures of the twelve Apostles; it is thought to be derived from the Jewish Ephod.

The final outer vestment is like a cope rather than a chasuble. As has been pointed out, bishops wear the Latin

mitre, also a pectoral cross, and have a staff like the Roman one, but that of the vartapedes has two twined serpents at the top (signifying wisdom). The *omophorion* (or *pallium*) is wide and large. It should be pointed out that the Byzantine *panagia* (i.e. a medallion of Christ or our Lady) is worn.

With regard to the catholicos, according to Mgr. Ormanian, a former Patriarch of Constantinople, in *The Church of Armenia* (English translation, London, 1912), he alone wears the ring on the ring finger (vartapedes and bishops have it on the little finger) and has the privilege of the *epigonation*.

It should be added here that for giving a blessing, the priest uses a small hand-cross with a metal handle; this lacks the figure of our Lord, but is said to contain a relic.

E. EKISLER.

(*To be continued.*)

A VISIT TO SOME OF THE MARONITE VILLAGES OF CYPRUS

BEING fortunate enough to spend eighteen months in Cyprus, I was glad of the opportunity given me by the Antiquities Department there to go about my favourite occupation, the preservation of mediaeval wall-paintings. I had, however, to limit my activities to work in those churches which have become government property, or which do not belong to the Orthodox Church of Cyprus.

Most of the paintings have at some time been more or less defaced by the Turks after their conquest of the island in the late sixteenth century; others, in ruined churches exposed to the weather, are dropping off the walls. Being given as assistant, a Maronite boy of eighteen who spoke English well, we planned an excursion together into the Maronite villages, which I was anxious to see, to clean and restore the wall paintings and eikons in their churches. I easily got permission to do this from the priest at Famagusta who is vicar for the whole island, under a bishop who lives in the Lebanon where most of his flock are, and from the priests in the different villages we visited who seemed delighted to have their paintings preserved.

The Maronite villages lie across the northern part of the island following the Kyrenia range of mountains. A great many of the villages, formerly Maronite, have lapsed, owing to the fierce persecution in the time of the Turkish occupation.

Visit to some Maronite villages in Cyprus 305

I travelled to Kormakiti from Nicosia in the post car ; the red-painted post box at the back, complete with G.R. and crown, held my luggage, while the post bags for the various villages *en route* lay on the floor and were unceremoniously thrown out on to the road as we reached their respective destinations.

KORMAKITI.

Kormakiti, the principal Maronite village, with over nine hundred inhabitants, all Maronite, lies at the north-west extremity of the island. It is peculiar in having a language of its own not understood elsewhere. It has a large new church, the money to build it saved in the course of years by the villagers themselves. There is also an older church still in use by the Franciscan Sisters who run the village school, besides a small fifteenth-century church of our Lady a little way out of the village, used only once a year for Mass on the feast of the Assumption. This little church was entirely covered inside with a contemporary series of paintings, representing scenes from the Passion, on the vault and walls—paintings which had once been fine, but terribly blackened by the candles which the people still light there ; and not only candles, but tins of oil with strips of cotton for wicks which flare up and blacken the walls and roof, so that my efforts to restore them were not so successful as I could have wished. They are, however, a good deal more visible than they were, all the subjects are recognisable, and we were able to fix the falling plaster to the walls. The Cypriots have an unfortunate habit of sticking a candle on to the surface of the painting of one whom they desire to honour, and setting light to it, with most disastrous results to the painting, whether on wall or eikon on wood. A one time beautiful, large eikon of our Lady in this church is now consumed to a cinder, only her face remaining and the halo of her Child.

In the sacristy of the large church are preserved a few eikons, these I mended and cleaned. One large one of their patron St. George is of good quality.

It was the month of May, and in the evenings the whole village resorted to this church for the May devotions to our Lady. These consisted of rosary and litany in Greek, followed by a peculiar ceremony. The priest, vested in a stole, facing the congregation, holds up an eikon of our Lady above his head while he sings, alternately with the choir of boys, a hymn in her praise in Greek, at the end making the sign of the cross with the picture above the heads of the people. They sometimes have Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament

given in the same way, the priest elevating the Blessed Sacrament for the whole time the hymn is sung.

KARPASHA.

I next visited Karpasha, my boy's own village and a most charming little place situated on a high plateau close to the mountains. Here the church is partly old, partly rebuilt. The chief treasures of this church are two fine old rood crosses that hang on the walls, one of the seventeenth century rather characteristically Cypriot of a rustic type, the other Byzantine in style, an accomplished painting, the figure of our Lord in sombre colouring on a black and gold cross with the emblems of the Evangelists in the extremities. The date, according to Professor Soteriou of Athens, is fifteenth century.

After cleaning and preserving all the eikons, the crosses and the wall-painting, I was interested to see, on the Sunday, what the village people's reaction would be, and was glad to see their interest in the eikons when they crowded round them after the Liturgy. It is a thousand pities that in most of the churches the traditional eikons are pushed away into any hole or corner and the most terrible plaster statues put up in their place. I suspect that if the eikons become objects of interest to visitors and more attention is drawn to them, the people will gladly go back to them, and that they merely follow their priests in thinking the statues more up to date and "Western."

The Sunday Liturgy was at 6. Alas, I overslept, and when I got to the church at a quarter past, was touched, if rather embarrassed, to find the whole village waiting outside and the bell ringer waiting to ring the last bell till I should appear. I was given the best chair and the only kneeler, and the Liturgy began. The people all sit on little squat chairs, about a foot high. In some churches I saw they had stools or logs of wood upturned to sit on. The men were all in front, and the women at the back, the men singing the Arabic chant which goes on almost continuously. The pax was given the whole way round the church, to the server, the minister, the men, and lastly to the women and children. This ceremony consists of the giver laying his hands over the clasped hands of the receiver.

The church is dedicated in honour of the Holy Cross, Stavros, and on Holy Cross day the older of the two crosses is carried in procession round the outside of the church. I was told by Mr. Markou, the mukhtar or headman of the village, and the father of my assistant, that near the village there is a stone

circle—this the people call Stavros and say that it was once a church.

Mr. Markou kindly gave me much information about the Maronite villages. He said there were formerly two illuminated manuscript service books written in ancient Syriac and with many pictures in them. Thirty years ago the commissioner for the district saw them, and bought them both for £1 and is said to have sold them to the Vatican Library for £1,000. Such stories in Cyprus should be received with caution.

I afterwards visited Kamyli, now entirely Turkish, and saw the old Maronite church there. It is a small cruciform church with a dome, much altered at some time, quite bare inside. I also visited Asomatos, the only other village that is entirely Maronite.

AYIA MARINA.

The village is partly Maronite and partly Turkish. The ancient Byzantine church of St. John Kokinokhromos, one and a half miles from the village, has recently been rebuilt by the Maronites.

The only monastery still in occupation by Maronite monks is St. Elias, near St. Marina and about six miles from Karpasha. Here there are four monks.

KOUTSOVENDIS.

In a beautiful valley, on the slopes of the mountains to the east of Kyrenia, below the Orthodox monastery of St. Chrysostomos and now belonging to it, lies the ruined church of our Lady, Koutsovendis. The mukhtar of Karpasha told me the village was formerly Maronite, and this was their church; when the village ceased to be Maronite the church was left to fall into ruins. It consists of two churches joined together, the earlier and smaller roofless. The interior is completely painted, the east part in an accomplished Byzantine manner, probably of the early fourteenth century, the west parts and narthex with large standing figures of saints, rather later and in a more Syrian style. The earlier paintings are a series of the Passion of our Lord: on the north wall are recognisable the Crucifixion and Deposition, and below them, the finest painting in the church, the Entombment, with, to the west, a fragment which probably formed part of a Harrowing of Hell. There have been more scenes on the south wall but they have perished. The east wall, on either side of the apse are figures of saints; on the north, St. Symeon Stylites; and on the south another saint on a pillar, destroyed.

The St. Symeon is very fine, the head and face full of character. Round the apse are figures of bishops and patriarchs, in the usual Byzantine manner. I cleaned and preserved all these paintings but could not do those in the larger, domed church adjoining as I had no scaffold.

The Hegumenos of St. Chrysostomos and his mother were extremely kind in putting us both up in the monastery.

VOUNO.

Vouno, a village next to Koutsovendis, is still partly Maronite. St. Romanos, the Maronite church, has a Liturgy only once a year, on the 4th September. There are several fine eikons. "St. George, dated 1698; B.V.M. and Christ, both by the same painter, dated 1690; St. Romanos, sixteenth century; and the Body of Christ after deposition, with a kneeling donor, c. 1520." (Rupert Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus*, 1936, p. 464).

The eikon of St. Romanos is a particularly fine painting, large in size; the fifth is also of good quality, the standing figure of our Lord of Pity, with donor, on a gold background.

KYTHREA.

Kythrea, the village where the first cauliflower grew, is partly Maronite and partly Greek Orthodox. It lies N.E. of Nicosia and not far from Koutsovendis. I was not able to go there.

"St. Andronicos, a small ancient chapel belonging to the Maronites, contains an icon of St. Andronicos with a long inscription in Arabic, dated 1681: one of the B.V.M. Galataga, a good example of an untouched sixteenth-century eikon, and one of St. Macarios supported by two saints dated 1692." (Rupert Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus*, p. 308).

The ruined church of St. Antony, on top of a hill, was Maronite and so was the church of St. Marina, now Orthodox.

There are Maronite churches in the towns of Nicosia, Larnaca and Famagusta. At Famagusta the Latin Catholics go to the Maronite church as there is no Latin church. Nicosia and Larnaca have both Latin and Maronite churches and priests. It is unfortunately noticeable that in the towns the Maronite is regarded as the peasant church and that as the people rise in the world they are apt to leave their own rite for the Latin. It has been suggested that the Latin priests might do more to discourage this tendency which is directly contrary to the clear instructions of the Holy See.

MONICA BARDSWELL.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

THE ASCETIC AND THEOLOGICAL TEACHING OF GREGORY PALAMAS.

We promised our readers an article by a Catholic theologian dealing with the thesis of Father Basil Krivoshein which appeared in last year's *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*. The reply has unfortunately been delayed but will be forthcoming in the course of the year. In the meanwhile we proffer a few comments that may help the reader in understanding the subject better.

I. The first comment concerns the affirmation of Palamas "that it is impossible to apprehend God by reason or to express Him in words. This idea that God cannot be rationally apprehended is connected with the whole of Gregory's doctrine on the divine nature" (*E.C.Q.*, January 1938, p. 27). We added a footnote quoting the Vatican Council that God can be known by the light of human reason through created things and giving a reference to St. Paul (Rom. i, 20).

We received in a letter from an Orthodox monk in Jerusalem the following reply: "Of course we accept the teaching of St. Paul that one can attain to a knowledge about God, as can be seen from Orthodox Catechisms, etc. Father Basil wishes no doubt to distinguish between knowledge *about* God, and knowledge obtained through prayer and personal experience." It has also been pointed out by a Catholic monk that this affirmation of Gregory Palamas can be in agreement with the teaching of the Vatican Council since Palamas means the real essence of God and not the fact of His existence, and Gregory acquires this knowledge in the classic way of apophatic theology (negative).

The second subject discussed in part one (*E.C.Q.*, April 1938, p. 71, etc.) is that of the rôle Gregory assigns to the heart in the spiritual and intellectual life, and his teaching concerning the "artistic" mental prayer and its methods. Of both these points we think the footnotes we appended to the text are enough explanation without going into a treatise on the "prayer of Jesus." Here Catholics will find little to gainsay.

II. This part of the thesis deals with substance and energy in God or, as Father Basil puts it, "the idea which underlies Gregory's teaching on the Divinity may be expressed as the assertion at one and the same time of God's totally inaccessible transcendental and 'extra-universal' nature and of His self-revelation to and immanent and real presence in the world" (*E.C.Q.*, July 1938, p. 138).

Some further quotations of Father Basil will put the case clearly. In regard to the energies he says: "These energies which are conceived by Gregory Palamas as manifestations and exteriorizations of God Himself and as inseparable from Him are naturally (in accordance with his whole teaching on the Divinity) found to be uncreated (since there is nothing created in God) and are given the name of God; in fact this name is more properly applicable to them than to the Divine substance which is altogether inexpressible and unnamable" (ibid., p. 140). And later on, speaking of Gregory's defence of the simplicity of God, he says: "And of course 'substance' and 'energies' are no more 'parts' of the divine 'whole' than the Hypostases are parts of the Triune God, but each contains Him, though with this difference, that the energies express God not hypostatically nor substantially, but only in His undiminished act" (ibid., p. 151).

In a note speaking of the distinction between the substance and hypostasis in God he says: "Evidently, this is one of the differences between his theology and that of the thomists who deny all real distinction between substance and hypostasis and admit it only between the hypostases as related one to another. It appears to us that Thomism manifests here its habitual incapacity to think 'antinomically'" (ibid., p. 153, note 13).

At this point we think a quotation concerning the "Sophia" will throw some light on this line of thought. "In Bulgakov's conception Sophia is not an attribute or an abstraction. She is a real entity or rather a real being. There are two aspects of Sophia: Sophia uncreated and Sophia created. Sophia uncreated is the Holy Wisdom existing in the Trinitarian life. As such Sophia is the Idea of ideas, the prototype of all things in the divine thought. She is not God but she belongs to Him and dwells in Him. Sophia is the common life of the Three Persons. In her is revealed God's nature. In her does the Logos reveal Himself as Wisdom. In her does the Holy Spirit reveal Himself as glory. She is God's body or garment. She is the object, the content of the Godhead. As for Sophia created, she is the outpouring of Sophia uncreated; we should not say outside God (for Bulgakov, who rejects resolutely pantheism, admits the fact and term 'panentheism') but outside God's immanent life, into the external world ontologically distinct from God" (vid. *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought*, Nadejda Gorodetzky, p. 160). Father Bulgakov himself says: "In its inner meaning the teaching of Gregory Palamas on the divine energies also belongs to the doctrine of the Divine Wisdom." This, however, Father Basil rejects (vid. E.C.Q., October 1938, p. 214,

note 69), yet we think that the doctrine of the Sophia helps us to understand Gregory's teaching.

We leave the question here and await the article for further Catholic comment; the teaching of theologians concerning the manifestation of God *ad extra* if studied carefully might lead both sides to see that the gulf between them is not so wide as it may appear.

III. The last part deals with Gregory's teaching concerning the uncreated Divine Light. The state of divine illumination and vision of uncreated light is described by Gregory Palamas, thus: "To those who see God He is light and nothing else; and that which the sun is in the sensible world, God is in the intellectual . . . (the man) who has received as his blessed portion the divine action . . . is himself, as it were, the Light and is with the Light and together with the Light consciously beholds that which, without such grace, is hidden from all: (for he is) raised not only above the bodily senses but above everything known to us . . . for he whose heart is purified sees God . . . Who being the Light dwells with and reveals Himself to those who are purified in mind as in a mirror. Remaining invisible in Himself like the face reflected in a mirror appearing (in it) yet (itself) unseen; and it is quite impossible to see anything in the mirror and at the same time to see that which reflects itself in it" (E.C.Q., October 1938, p. 198). We think some reference to St. Bonaventure's teaching of the illumination of the intellect will show an affinity between Palamas and some Catholic thought. Etienne Gilson writes in *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*: "Man can do nothing without God and in consequence God's action must be present everywhere with man; but it must be thus visible without God Himself becoming so: for the perpetual intervention of God in man is required by man's profound misery, whereas if man were to see God his end would at once be reached and his misery effaced. If we bring this fundamental intuition into the domain of knowledge, . . . man cannot know any truth without God, but he cannot see God. It is just this activity within thought of a transcendent energy present there, the source of which must remain hidden from it, that St. Bonaventure's doctrine of eternal principles is intended to explain" (ibid., p. 388). St. Bonaventure loves to cite this text of the Epistle of St. James: *Omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum est descendens a Patre luminum* (i, 17); in his eyes intellectual illumination is only a particular case of general illumination which includes not only knowledge but the gifts of graces with their virtues and their fruits.

We are quite aware that the affinity between the Orthodox mystic and the Catholic saint cannot be pushed too far, yet we feel that perhaps the subject might be approached along these lines. It must be borne in mind that for Gregory Palamas the Uncreated Divine Light is one of the Divine Energies. But we intend at a future date to have the points raised here answered from the Catholic side.

THE EDITOR.

GREECE.

IN MEMORY OF CHRYSOSTOM, ARCHBISHOP OF ATHENS.

In recording the death of the Archbishop, the *Church Times* of October 28th, 1938, says :

“ His Beatitude Chrysostom, the Metropolitan of Athens, died on Saturday morning last at the age of seventy years. His death takes an outstanding personality from the Orthodox Church, and a man who was revered and beloved far beyond the confines of his own jurisdiction.

Chrysostom Papadoulos was born in 1868 in a small town in Eastern Thrace, where his father was a priest. Chrysostom himself was essentially a priest, with a high sense of duty and an intense zeal for the pastoral office and the care of souls.

He was educated first at Constantinople, and then at the Theological School of the Cross at Jerusalem, after which he studied theology for two years at the University of Athens. In 1891 he went to Russia, where he spent some four years, continuing his theological studies at the Academies of Kiev and St. Petersburg, as it then was. He returned with his degree to take up a professorship at his old School of the Cross at Jerusalem, and four years later he was appointed its Principal. About the same time he was ordained deacon, and, six months later, priest by the Patriarch of Jerusalem. He remained at Jerusalem for fourteen years and then went for a short while to Alexandria.

In 1911 he was appointed Head of the famous Rizarion Theological College in Athens. The University of Athens had already conferred upon him an Honorary Doctorate in Theology, and in 1914 he succeeded Kyriakos in the Chair of General Ecclesiastical History. He left the Rizarion in 1923 to become Archbishop of Athens and Primate of Greece, but he continued his connexion with the University as an Honorary Professor to the end.

The Metropolitan Chrysostom was a man of great learning, and a most prolific writer, but with it all a really humble man. The great Archimandrite, Michael Constantinidis, who knew him well, wrote of him in 1936 as 'the most learned and erudite man in all the Orthodox Church, and one of the most voluminous writers in the world.' He places 335 books and pamphlets to his credit. His writings are mainly concerned with the ecclesiastical history, but he wrote also on ethics and other subjects."

The Archbishop was a reader of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY right from its early stages when the Editor first launched the venture through the courtesy of PAX. We here subjoin a letter sent us by his Grace on receiving the July issue of the EASTERN CHURCHES NUMBER OF PAX for 1931. In the same number there had appeared an outspoken review of the Archbishop's book on Anglican Orders by the late Abbot Chapman.

ATHENS,
July 24th, 1931.

THE VERY REV. BEDE WINSLOW, O.S.B.,
St. Augustine's Abbey,
Ramsgate, England.

REVEREND,

It was a great pleasure to us to receive the PAX of July 1931, which you were so kind to send us and for which we thank you very much. We deeply appreciate your work and your noble endeavours for a true and mutual understanding between the Churches of God.

It is very agreeable indeed that the PAX is especially interested in making known to the Christians of the West the Church of Christ in the East which is often misunderstood in the West.

We believe that if the quarterly is always written scientifically and impartially and far from prejudices and misunderstandings, it will study and examine objectively the things concerning the Eastern Church which continues respecting the old sister Church of the West.

Such scientific and of a Christian-like spirit studies and elucidations will greatly cultivate, we feel sure, the ground for the desired union of the Churches. That longed for union cannot be brought about by a propaganda among certain members nor by proselytizing of individuals, as some do, unfortunately, provoking in that way scandals and hatreds among the Christian Churches, but by a thoroughly mutual understanding and approach of the Churches.

Congratulating you and invoking the blessing of God upon you and your work,

We remain,

Sincerely yours,

✠ CHRYSOSTOM,

ARCHBISHOP OF ATHENS AND ALL GREECE.

We ask our readers to pray for the repose of the soul of the late Archbishop of Athens. R.I.P.

NEW GREEK RELIGIOUS LAWS.

The following is a summary of the thirteen articles of the new laws issued by the Ministry of Religions in September 1938. The Ministry of Religions is a governmental department concerned with all religions—Jewish, Moslem, Christian, of all denominations—but there is a concordat between the Government and the Orthodox which is the Established Church of Greece.

1. Concerned with definitions of certain terms : *church*, temple, etc.

2. Statistics are to be furnished to the Ministry within two months, of all the faithful of each creed or religion or heresy, individually and by families, of all churches whether in use or not, of the families using each church, of schools of every nature with their programme, and also the names of all clergy and religious serving each parish. These statistics are to be certified by the police and the Department.

Any inexactitude in this information falls under the rules of the penal law concerning the punishment of those who make false declarations.

3. Concerned with the movable and unmovable property of every religious body.

4. "What is Proselytism?"

Defined as "any attempt to penetrate the conscience of one of another faith, adult or minor, with a view to changing the content of that faith, etc." "Proselytism" is forbidden whether achieved "by force or threat or unlawful means, or the giving or promising of money or anything else, by deceitful means or promises, by the bestowal of moral or material aid, by the abuse of inexperience or confidence, or profiting by the needs or spiritual weakness or simplicity or in general any way whatsoever whether direct or indirect, successful or unsuccessful effort or attempt to influence the religious conscience of members of other religions, whether minors or adults, with a view to the change, witting or unwitting, of the content of their religious conscience, that is,

of their religious faith, and a conforming on their part to the ideas and convictions of the proselytizer."

5. Penalties for "proselytism."

After an administrative enquiry, if elements of proselytism have been proved, the proselytizer

(i) *If alien*, shall be expelled from the country by the Committee of Security. Appeal against the decision of the Committee may be made to the Minister of Religions within three days.

(ii) *If a Greek subject*, shall be called before the Tribunal, and may be punished by a fine up to 50,000 drachmas and by imprisonment, and afterwards may be put under police supervision for a period of time to be fixed by the Tribunal. The action of proselytizing in schools, educational or charitable institutions shall be a case for particularly heavy punishment.

6. (i) Churches built without permission of the Ministry of Religions must be closed. This includes buildings formerly used for other purposes and adapted. Penalty from 10,000 to 50,000 drachmas and two to six months' imprisonment.

(ii) Permission must be obtained from the Ministry for building any seminary or religious institution and sanction for existing ones must be obtained within three months under pain of closure.

7. It is forbidden to take infants or generally children under fourteen belonging to Orthodox families into orphanages founded or kept by non-Orthodox, and children now in such orphanages within six months of the promulgation of this law are obliged to enter county council or ecclesiastical (Orthodox) institutions, which are bound to accept them whether they have room or not. The Ministries of Health and Public Assistance and of Religions are obliged to take all children from such schools and institutions and place them in their own schools and institutions.

8. (i) Religious books not conforming to Orthodox dogmas and traditions may only be published under the following conditions :

(a) "They must be sold in a shop clearly bearing a title indicating the creed or religion or heresy to which the books on sale belong."

(b) "All books on sale must bear on the cover, indelibly printed, an indication of the creed, etc."

(c) "All books before circulation must be clearly stamped with an indelible stamp, by the office of the diocese where they are first put into circulation, stating the creed, etc."

(ii) All books already published must be withdrawn within a month for stamping. Penalty.

(iii) The authorities of the Prefecture are obliged in future to stamp all books concerned with stamps "indicating the religion (Christian, Jewish, Mussulman, etc.), creed (Western Papistical, Uniate Papistical, Protestant, Evangelical, etc.) or heresy (Chiliastic, etc.) and to acquaint the competent authorities of every contravention of this law that shall come under their notice."

(iv) Newspapers, periodicals, etc. in any way attacking established religion, etc. confiscated and future circulation irrevocably forbidden.

9. "Within one month of the publication of the new law, the recognised heads of religions or creeds in the kingdom are obliged to communicate to the Ministry of Religions their established sees."

Transference of heads of "religions or creeds" is allowed if the Ministry has been informed of the consent of the ecclesiastical authority from which they canonically depend.

The penalties for offences against this article range from 2,000 to 50,000 drachmas and imprisonment up to six months without option.

"Recognized clerics of Christian creeds of every rank and heads of heresies, independent of their nationality, may not be moved outside their own areas, it being understood in regard to heads outside their sees without leave of the Ministry of Religions."

10. "Clergy not belonging to the Orthodox Church are forbidden to make any religious act in an Orthodox Church and also to take part in processions wearing the dress which is the tradition of the Orthodox Church."

Offences against this article are to be punished according to the penal law in cases where a man adopts the dress which belongs to another.

11. Departure from Greece of clerics of any rank or heads of "creeds, religions or heresies" is allowed only when permission has been sought, with reasons stated, from the Ministry of Religions. (Which laws already apply to the Orthodox clergy.)

12. Entry into Greece of "all clerics whatsoever of religions or creeds or heresies or heads of heresies or of religious teachers independently of nationality is allowed only with permission of the Ministries of Religions and of Foreign Affairs."

"Transgressors will be expelled without further formality."

The organizations or officials responsible for the infringement of these laws are also to be punished.

13. "All schoolchildren must attend church on Sundays and feasts, accompanied by some member of the school staff."

This applies chiefly to the Orthodox.

"ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ," the official organ of the Orthodox Church in Greece, in the number following that containing the text of these laws, reports that the Archbishop of Athens, since deceased, thanked the Minister of Religions on behalf of the Holy Synod for these laws which had put an end to alien propaganda and at last defined proselytism.

The *Universe* on November 4th published a front page article on these laws. The paper by its headlines and cross-references vitiated the character of the article itself which gave a perfectly sober account. The above summary sets the laws out in order so that how much and how little they say can be clearly seen. It incorporates most of the *Universe* contributor's translation, but also completes it on one or two important points. In fact it is these points which bring out the object of the laws, though this is probably only evident to those who know at least a little of the religious situation in Greece. That these laws are aimed against Catholics, there being no other religious body of importance in Greece, is too broad a statement. They are aimed, from the point of view of an Established Church, a Greek national church, at the Uniates. The Greek Orthodox will say that the Uniates alone in Greece have proselytizing intentions. At least we may say that Catholics of Latin rite are not to be feared; to adopt the Latin rite is so obviously to de-nationalize oneself that it will not be a frequent occurrence. To proclaim one's loyalty to the Apostolic See while retaining one's full Byzantine rite, customs and Canon Law is in no way to de-nationalize oneself; but to the Orthodox Greek the very existence of such a body of pure Greek Catholics is insidious propaganda, using those things which belong to another to mask one's final intentions which are supposed to be a radical change to "Roman" ways of thinking.¹ This attitude is clearly shown by Article 9 of the above laws forbidding (to the Uniates, for it applies to no other body) the wearing of the dress "which is the tradition of the Orthodox Church." It is simply the dress of the Byzantine East whether in communion or not with Rome and is scarcely a copyright, but is obviously by them viewed as a disguise and deception.

The Orthodox view their church as the Catholic Church of Christ and therefore in deprecating proselytism, whether carried on by themselves or another, they are not basing themselves on the theory that all Christians are in an equally valid position, but are simply playing for safety, peace and

¹ The existence of Uniate bodies of course implies not insidious propaganda but a real love and respect for the Christian East and its liturgy and traditions.

the undivided family ; for once proselytism is allowed in principle, it must be allowed on either side.

In the case of Catholicism and Orthodoxy proselytism and individual conversion from one to another is indeed not to be desired as a thing to be aimed at, though occasional cases of individual conscience are inevitable (and the reason why such should be forced to change their rite is yet to be sought). Rather a real corporate reunion between the churches is to be desired and prayed for ; but for this study and contact and charity are needed.

The Catholics of Byzantine rite in Greece only consist of a bishop and some fifteen clergy and couple of thousand of laity, mostly among the refugees from Turkey. They have one house in Athens, which is the bishop's and priests' house and orphanage, all in one. It contains a small domestic chapel and a printing press. The bishop has founded a congregation of nuns of the rite who have a large building, newly erected and as yet no more than a shell, which houses their girls' school. It will be seen how Article 7, forbidding the admittance or retention of children of Orthodox parents in such schools and orphanages will affect them. Neither this nor Article 9 were mentioned by the *Universe*, but Article 8 referring to books and periodicals, which was fully reported, also touches them in their printing press.

The prohibition of proselytism "whether direct or indirect, successful or unsuccessful," and whether the change is "witting or unwitting" is carrying it to a length perhaps unparalleled in the long history of religious laws.

It may be noted that the movements of all Greek subjects outside Greece (Article 11) has for some time been complicated by laws.

State compulsion in church-going (13) is a thing which most countries have happily by now given up ; it is curious to find it newly enacted.

The laws are strangely without safeguard ; they are so worded that, though appearing to apply to all "religions, creeds and heresies," the whole force of them could be brought to bear on a single body, at the discretion of the Ministry. Moreover they are sufficiently insidious for it to be quite impossible for anyone who should chance to be suspect not to be "caught out" under one head or another. When one realizes the wide range of actions and words that might come under the head of "the bestowal of moral aid," and that these need have no correlative results to be assumed to be at least an unsuccessful attempt to proselytize, one realizes the scope. It is a process that, once begun, may, under the system of reporting and police supervision, gather momentum like a snowball.

It may be noted that there are some 50,000 Catholics of Latin rite in Greece, almost entirely the result of Venetian days. They are in Corfu and the Aegean and Ionian Islands, in some of which they form the majority of the population. The Orthodox say of them that they have become hellenized and absorbed into the population; that they hold positions of trust in the government and elsewhere; that they do not attempt proselytism, and that these laws are not aimed at them.

A MEETING OF THE CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE OF FAITH AND ORDER.

The meeting took place at St. George's School, Clarens, Switzerland, August 29th to September 1st, 1938.

The Archbishop of York was chairman. Among those present were the Metropolitan Germanos, Dr. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. R. L. Flew (Methodist Church of Great Britain), Father S. Bulgakov, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft (Swiss Church Federation), and Canon L. Hodgson was the theological and general secretary.

During the sessions the conference discussed two important plans. One for the study of the subject of the Church; the other for the study of liturgical questions. In connection with the study of the subject of the Church, the Secretary read part of a memorandum "in which was set out a scheme of five years' work, beginning with an attempt to discover what obstacles to unity are presented by our present conceptions of the Church, and going on to consider how far these could be removed."

The Bishop of Gloucester said: "I do not think that the Secretary's plan is the right one. It suggests that we should first try to find out what the difficulties are and then search for ways of overcoming them. But what we have to do is to ask what is the truth about the Church, that is to say, what is the teaching of Our Lord and the Holy Spirit. My experience in our other Commissions is that it is by study of what is the fundamental Christian doctrine that we make progress. The only way of advance is to get real scholars of different points of view and to get them to work together for discovering what is true, studying Scripture, the Fathers, Luther, Calvin, etc. I suggest that the two commissions should be set to work at once on the one subject of the doctrine of the Church, that we should give them three years, and that when they have reported we should go back to the doctrine of the Ministry and Sacraments."

Father Bulgakov said : " I am satisfied that after Edinburgh we must ask ' What is the Church ? ' It is our weakness that we have never faced this question and cannot answer it. I agree with the Bishop of Gloucester that we need scholars to study Scripture and history with a view to asking this question, what is the Church ? And we must ask. Can we justify the œcumenical movement ? Do we sin against our own Churches by gathering here and praying together and seeking a common theology ? We all know the Roman Catholic point of view and that we do not hold it, but do we know what other view we do hold ? And there is the question of Mariology."

Archbishop Germanos said that " At Edinburgh everyone was surprised that the theme of the Church was combined with that of the Word of God ; the subject was ' The Word of God and the Church,' and not ' The Meaning of the Church.' Then the Ministry was combined with the Sacrament and not with the Church where it belonged. We should take as our subject not the Church, but the Church and its Ministry, because you cannot have the one without the other."

There were other speakers and it was decided to form a committee to study the nature of the Church. This is to be composed of about thirty theologians, but not more than fifteen will come to the discussions and draw up the report. The Bishop of Gloucester said : " Of course Roman Catholics must be considered and I hope that again" (there were two Catholic theologians among those who prepared the report on the Ministry and the Sacraments) " it may be possible to get good Roman Catholic theologians to help us."

As regards plans for the study of liturgical questions, the Secretary said he had " a letter from the Rev. O. S. Tomkins (the associate secretary in America and representing the Youth Group) suggesting the preparation of a pamphlet explaining this matter and of leaflets describing different liturgical traditions, and a letter from the Dean of Chichester suggesting the summoning of a small liturgical conference."

The Chairman pointed out that in the draft letter (it had been suggested that one should be sent) it was stated that care must be taken that whatever was done was done with the approval of the church authorities concerned.

Dr. Tomkins said : " that in the small town in which he lived in America at the instance of one of the lay members of his congregation they had last Lent had a series of five services in the five churches, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Swedish Mission Covenant, Congregational and Episcopal. Each minister had conducted his own service in his own

way and they were attended by members of all the others. At the Roman Catholic church, for example, the service was the Stations of the Cross. The result was a remarkable change of the spiritual atmosphere in the whole town. But the point he wished to emphasise was that the initiative had come from lay members of the congregation without whose interest and zeal it might never have been thought of."

Rev. E. J. Hagan said: "I wish to bring a suggestion from the Church of Scotland, that in any such study of liturgical questions a predominant place should be given to intercommunion."

Professor Hertford said: "We are indebted to Mr. Tomkins for his letter and I believe that something can be done to-day on the lines of that letter. It is important that we should get to know something about each other's worship, and his method is the proper way to approach the study of liturgical questions, and I would propose that a small committee, whose chairman might well be Dr. Brilioth or the Dean of Chichester, with power to add to their number, might be set up to prepare the pamphlets of which Mr. Tomkins speaks. Then at the end of that work in two years' time we should be better equipped to begin the work of a full commission. I should also like to say that I believe that there is a good deal of value in the proposal for a liturgical conference made by the Dean of Chichester."

Pastor Boegner said: "It is important to distinguish two questions: (a) interconfessional services and intercommunion, (b) the gaining of mutual knowledge of one another's own worship. The former is something we are familiar with, but the latter is different and involves a study as complete as possible of one another's liturgical tradition. But this involves a study which would be an immense undertaking, as immense as Dr. Flew has shown is the study of the Church. It involves, for example, the study of the doctrine contained in the Liturgy, for it has been said '*la liturgie est le dogme prié*.' To appoint a commission to undertake such a task is to appoint it to study the history of liturgical traditions and their doctrinal justification. I would support the appointment of such a commission which might in the course of its work do what Mr. Tomkins and the Dean of Chichester want, but its main aim should be a thorough study of this vast subject."

The Secretary said: "We have before us three distinct proposals: (i) Mr. Tomkins' proposal aiming at securing the writing of these pamphlets, (ii) the Dean of Chichester's for some sort of a liturgical conference, and (iii) Pastor Boegner's for a thoroughgoing study of the history and

doctrinal justification of Liturgies—as thorough a study as that undertaken by Dr. Flew’s commission on the Church. It seems to me that we here have a subject so vast and uncharted that it is impossible to attempt at this one meeting adequately to get started a commission which is to work over the next three or four years and produce results, because we don’t yet know what kind of results we want. The Edinburgh Conference Report urges on the Continuation Committee the study of liturgical questions, either by a commission or by what other method seems best. It is clear therefore that we are embarking on something new in which we have not got the experience of the past to guide us as to the best method of approach. And I am now coming to think that before we set up a definite commission we need to set up something in the way of a preparatory commission to take these different suggestions in charge, think out lines on which this new venture should be made, and have proposals for another meeting of this Committee or the Executive Committee, which can state more definitely what we mean to engage in as our main undertaking in this field. I would therefore suggest that on this subject our discussion should be as free and wide as possible, but that our aim should not be the setting up of a commission on the subject, but the commissioning of a group which shall take into consideration all this material which we have before us in the light of the discussion at this meeting, and recommend lines on which the Edinburgh resolution can best be carried out.”

Rev. O. S. Tomkins said: “On this question of worship I should like to make one or two points because I believe that in the World Student Christian Federation we have had some experience on the kind of consideration before us. I should like to distinguish between principle and strategy, because I don’t feel altogether happy that the Committee has grasped that distinction. The whole question seems to me of such tremendous importance that I welcome Canon Hodgson’s suggestion that we should not let the thing go without action of some kind. It is one of the first principles of our œcumenical work that we recognise as a fellow Christian a man from another tradition because he belongs to that tradition and not in spite of it, and that means that we must overcome a tremendous amount of prejudice, and it is here that lies one of the chief difficulties of our œcumenical work. Then in the second place, it is when we see that expressed in worship that we see it most clearly. Churches at worship are at their most defenceless, coming frankly into the presence of God.

“If we enter into this kind of experiment we shall have

to face facts at their most brutal. But it is something more than an uncomfortable experience; it has also got in it the promise of a deeper understanding of unity. An Orthodox friend once said to me, 'When you see the Cup framed in other hands you feel most strongly the pain of disunity and also the reality of the underlying unity.' I believe that if we refuse to face the kind of issue involved we are not being true to our œcumenical experience which has led us into recognising that in worship we understand at a deeper level and in a more acute way the things we have so far sought to understand by the other methods in the Faith and Order Movement.

"Perhaps the boldest experiment on these lines is the decision made in preparing for the Amsterdam Youth Conference in 1939 to try and let those young delegates enter into this kind of experience by having a part of the programme consisting of services of worship in the full tradition of the various churches; the delegates will be encouraged to go to those services in order that they may try to see something of the soul of the other churches. And that is why in the letter I sent to the Secretary the pamphlet I should like to lay most emphasis on is the explanatory one. And so I hope we shall not let this opportunity go by without a very careful and determined exploration of the possibilities."

The Bishop of Gloucester said: "I probably agree with all that Mr. Tomkins has said. I have probably attended services at more different churches than most people here, and I have gained much of great value. But I could not recommend the practice suggested from the Secretary's draft in my own diocese. We need to train up people in loyalty to their own churches."

Dr. Schönfeld: "I want to support Pastor Boegner's proposal. The discussion on the Church has shown the necessity of the very thing emphasised by Pastor Boegner and endorsed by Canon Hodgson. In our discussions on the Church we see and know the Church in its whole reality. In the liturgical movements in the churches to-day there is growing understanding; for example, in the Catholic churches there is a new understanding of the significance of the Word, and in the more Protestant churches there is a growing understanding of how the Word of Scripture is both taught and preached in the Catholic churches. It is absolutely necessary that the commission on the Church should remain in close touch with the liturgical commission and be ready to receive suggestions from it.

"This liturgical renewal has just begun to open the eyes of us from the Protestant churches to an understanding of the

meaning of the church life of our Orthodox brethren, and so this may help to prepare the way for further unity. Another point is that these liturgical movements are not a matter for a few specialists, but they penetrate to the ordinary members of the churches.

"I should like further to report, since Bishop Küry is not here, that at the Old Catholic Congress it was decided to set up a committee to study the meaning of the liturgical experience of the Old Catholic churches themselves for the œcumenical life, and then to go on further to study the meaning of all Christian worship for themselves."

The Secretary said: "It was clear that they were not sufficiently advanced to proceed at this meeting to the appointment of a commission. He proposed that the Continuation Committee should meet again in the following summer and that in the meantime he should consult with various people in the light of that discussion that had taken place and would try to be prepared with suggestions which might lead to the setting up of the kind of commission which the subject really required."

This will give some idea of the value of the conference. All the quotations are taken from the little booklet issued by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order (No. 91, to be had from Christ Church, Oxford).

THE ORTHODOX CLERGY IN RUSSIA.

*The following is taken from *Blackfriars*.

"An outstanding feature of the renascent religious life in Russia is *poverty*. All the sumptuousness of the Orthodox rite has disappeared in the agony. It has given way to surroundings which recall those of the primitive Christian communities. The Liturgy has retained only the barest essentials: the chalices are of pewter or wood, the chasubles of crudely coloured cloth; the priest lives on alms and dwells in a tumbled-down ruin or hides in the woods. Perhaps he is a young man who has been secretly ordained, or an old monk rendered homeless by the persecution. In any case, very different from the big-bellied pope which the antireligious propaganda represents with guns and bags of gold holding out his hand to the capitalist.

"The social influence of the priest has thus grown considerably. Especially in the country districts, the clergy share more and more in the daily life and work of their parishioners.

* *Blackfriars*, Sept., 1938. Made up of articles from *Esprit*, *Les Dernières Nouvelles*.

They join in the activity of the Kolkhoze and even of the factory, and there they are often particularly useful in expounding the economic or social measures taken by the government, or for the part they play in union activity, or in putting at the disposal of the faithful their culture and technical experience."—From *Esprit*, July.

"The priest is a typical representative of the sovietic intelligentsia. He has a passion for reading—books, reviews and newspapers. He is intensely interested in current events and in what is called sovietic social activity. He has submitted to the general trend of Russian life; having become more 'realistic' he has by that fact become more Europeanized. He is more like a Catholic curé or a Protestant pastor than his predecessors. He is in turns a medical practitioner, an agriculturalist or a horticulturalist. He seeks to penetrate everywhere, and he often succeeds; he works for the development of aviation, and takes active part in the various 'days' of 'Youth,' of 'Woman,' of 'Frontier Defense.' It often happens that the local party head and the priest, although officially hostile to one another, work hand in hand to inspire the seasonal agricultural activities or in the propaganda campaigns which have social aims. Whenever there is a call 'to mobilize all the forces of the country,' the Soviet priest will be in the front line.

"But it is precisely this new type of priest, who differs so enormously from that ridiculed by the antireligious propaganda, that causes anxiety to the Soviet leaders. On the eve of the elections these realized that the warnings of Kroupskaya were only too well grounded, and that the clergy were a very important factor in the electoral campaign. . . . Yaroslavsky (head of the 'Godless') cited these figures: 'If it is remembered that the number of believers constitutes thirty per cent. of the population of the towns, it will at once be seen that there are millions of Soviet subjects who are faithful to religion. Among the rural population, two-thirds are believers.'

"Yaroslavsky continued: 'There are some people who take comfort from the thought that a great number of churches are closed, and think that that means the end of religion. That is a great mistake. The danger consists precisely in the fact that, although the churches have been closed, our work has not been seriously effective among the masses. The priests are without their churches, but they are surrounded by their faithful. They have simply become 'travelling priests.' The 'travelling priest' sets out with his paraphernalia, which can all be carried in a light suitcase: a censer, some bread and a flask of wine for Communion,

He goes from village to village. If he has not visited a village for a year or so, he baptizes all the children who have been born in the meanwhile, conducts marriages and funerals. Though the churches have been shut, the priests continue to be necessary in the eyes of the people. . . .

"According to the official figures quoted by Yaroslavsky, there are at the present time 30,000 parishes in the U.S.S.R. legally recognized and registered. Each of these parishes counts some twenty-five religious enthusiasts forming a sort of confraternity to assist the priests. There are therefore about 750,000 *militant* Christians working legally among the masses and contributing largely to the upkeep and development of Christian life. . . .

"In spite of the antireligious offensive launched before Easter, the churches were packed. The Soviet press continues to deplore the collective baptisms of the 'travelling priests' and the immense attraction which religion still exercises on the peasants and workers. Confronted with this invincible spiritual power, terrorism itself remains impotent."—From *Les Dernières Nouvelles*.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

DEAR SIR,

I find that I am generally in complete agreement with most of Vladimir Rodziauko's criticism and blame myself for a lack of lucidity in which I wrote.

Following his three headings I would like to say :

1. I am intensely pleased that there should be a movement amongst the Orthodox to take the trouble to be interested in our complicated English religious history and situation. It has often surprised me how very easily they seem to understand us. More so than many foreigners. We all know that there are many of our fellow countrymen, out of communion with us, who are holy men and who have a faith differing little from ourselves and the Orthodox. The late Cardinal Bourne is said to have once expressed this thought thus : "I have, in the course of my public ministry, met many heresies but very few heretics."

2. Certainly the same faith can be expressed in many ways. This will be true as long as races and nations have each their own particular mentality. Surely those Catholics of the Byzantine rite who are completely loyal to its spirit and who regard the Orthodox with sincere affection, are a great force for breaking down the barriers which divide us ? I must, however, frankly admit that I have been appalled

by the stupid and ignorant hostility shown towards the Orthodox by Catholics, of both Latin and Byzantine rite, in those parts of the world where these two great religious communions live side by side. I cannot blame Orthodox if they are repelled.

3. I am acquainted with all but two of the Orthodox authorities upon the question of Anglican Orders which he mentions. I cannot change my opinion that a great deal more historical study should be undertaken in this matter. It is interesting to note that the Catholic attitude towards this question may possibly be qualified by the recent union of the Old Catholic and Anglican churches. But the valid administration of Sacraments is surely of quite secondary importance with regard to reunion to the realization of unity in matters of faith.

By "British Orthodox Church" I presume the period before Christendom became divided is meant. We may all look back with longing to that time, and hope and pray that indeed the world may be cured by the Church and that we may one and all become rooted and grounded in universal orthodoxy.

EDWARD BOWRON.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Christus Victor: an historical study of the three main types of the idea of the Atonement. Gustaf Aulén. Translated by A. G. Hebert, M.A. (S.P.C.K., 1937). (Reprint of first ed. of 1931).

This book is a dispassionate historical study, but the facts force the author, and us with him, into a judgment on the relative merits of the Redemption-ideas studied. Dr. Aulén's thesis is that from apostolic times there has existed a classic idea of the way in which Redemption was effected—a doctrine distinct from both the Anselmic and the subjective theories. This classic idea he traces in Holy Scripture, in the Fathers, and up to our day. Its strongest expression he finds in Luther. He sees in it the necessary basis of modern Christian thought.

This classic idea of the Redemption has two characteristics—it is, first, dramatic and dualistic: God in Christ defeated sin, death and the Devil in open fight; second, it is double: sin, death and the Devil are not only God's enemies, but the instruments of His wrath, therefore God is at once the reconciler and the reconciled. And this is where a promising

line of thought trips up. For Dr. Aulén wishes to exclude all idea of satisfaction for sin coming from man—even from the God-man. Redemption, he says, must be a continuous action of God alone, unbroken by any action from man's side. This is why Luther expresses the classic conception so forcefully—because for Luther God's mercy is absolute, a complete otherness descending on a human nature corrupted in its very essence and remaining corrupted. If Dr. Aulén had examined the Fathers further along the line he began, he would have seen their Victory-Redemption is based on two facts—the recapitulation of mankind in Christ, and the sacramental nature of the Redeeming-Act. Then he would have been able to admit that mankind became truly cleansed and deified in the sufferings and triumph of their metaphysically representative Head, and that the Redeeming-Act is a simple divine act worked out through Christ's human nature in time and space in several stages, beginning at the Incarnation, but wholly present in each stage and growing to its fulness until its perfect manhood at the Ascension. Redemption thus conceived is the lifting up of man to God in the assumption of a human nature into union with the Word, more than a descending action of God. Mass is the lifting of each individual into the *nunc stans* of the accomplished Redeeming-Act—not, as Dr. Aulén sees it, a merely human sacrifice. Satisfaction here appears not as a juridical redemption, but as a minor organic part of a Victory-Redemption where man is freed from sin, not in Luther's merely nominalistic way, but by a real change in his nature.

Dr. Aulén's Protestant mentality has cut short his vision through no fault of his. His conception of atonement, sin, and reason in theology, are definitely Protestant and nominalistic. In spite of this his book is rich in important vistas, a deep treatment of a problem which will have to be solved by the liturgical theology of the present-day Church—how much value is to be given to satisfaction in the redemption? In his solution of this problem Dr. Aulén has the enormous merit of demanding recognition of the connection of the Incarnation with the redeeming death, and of redemption with justification; his revaluation of Luther will also prove useful. As far as it goes, his very up-to-date method of interpreting the Fathers and his assessment of their redemption-idea is perfectly accurate. Above all he has the right outlook—he knows that humanistic and juridical views and methods are quite useless to a Christianity which is demanding an organic, realistic and cosmic interpretation of Christ's Work.

DOM WILLIAM McLAUGHLIN.

Liturgy and Life. By Dom Theodore Wesseling. (Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1938). pp. 123. 3s. 6d.

The author says that the purpose of his book "is to make men realize the import of the Liturgy." In this aim we think he has done a very important thing to further the Liturgical Movement. The Liturgical Movement (in this country, at any rate) seems to have lost itself amid things of secondary value, historical, artistic and rubrical. History, art and rubrics are indeed necessary in their measure for the right understanding of and making use of the Church's Liturgy, but they should be considered only as a means to an end. If therefore the Liturgy is to become the life of Catholic Action, or if it is going to affect the life of the ordinary Catholic man and woman, it must be presented to them as something more essential to their lives than what may be called the refinements of Catholic culture however desirable these may be.

That more fundamental ideas in connection with the Liturgy are being demanded by the people, whether cleric or lay, letters to and articles in our Catholic press bear witness; but until now these ideas have not been given to the public in any very clear and definite way. Hence this little book does not only fill a gap in liturgical literature (in the English language), but it makes a claim for the Liturgy that should do much to bring it into the heart of the rising generation.

The book consists of three essays: *The Meaning of the Liturgy*, a very necessary point for readers who are witnessing the breakdown of individualism in religion; *The Liturgy and Man's Moral Structure*; and *The Vision of the Liturgy*. Of these, the first is a particular application of the principles set out in the previous essay and the last is an extension of these principles to their widest application. The Liturgy considered as the *Sacramentum Unitatis et Pacis* (in the last essay) applied to man as he is in himself, in his relation with his fellow-men, and in his relation with God, is a most invigorating piece of reading, as well as the point made in reference to "corporate mysticism."

We would recommend this book not only to Catholics who wish to build their own lives on the Liturgy, but also to Orthodox, for in it they will see they have much more in common with Catholicism than they thought. The Christian East holds most of this in the very depths of its soul and the people are to some extent aware of it, yet it may need the energy of a Westerner to bring it fully to light.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

Symbolism and Belief. By Edwyn Bevan. (Allen & Unwin)

This book contains part of a series of lectures given in 1933 and 1934 for the University of Edinburgh under the terms of the Gifford foundation, and their scope is necessarily limited by those terms.

The list of contents, Height, Time, Light, Spirit, etc., promises an intellectual feast for the thinker that is to a large extent fulfilled; though the real, if somewhat uncertain, agnosticism of the author robs the general argument of conviction. Mr. Bevan does not accept the scholastic principle of analogy which, as he truly says, steers a safe course between anthropomorphism and agnosticism, and consequently he has no reasoned arguments either about God's existence or His being. In place of reasoned argument he offers us a "direct perception of the Divine" as the only motive that causes anyone to believe in God; though he nowhere attempts to explain what he means by such perception. Anyone who will take the trouble to study Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange on "God: His Existence and His Nature" will find the proper antidote for Mr. Bevan's confusion of thought.

Nevertheless, Mr. Bevan is very interesting, and the reader who has already a rational grasp of the fundamental truth of God's existence will find much suggestive thought, particularly in the first chapters of the book, that can be usefully applied to deepen or enlarge his analogical knowledge of the Divine Being.

Symbolism and Belief is the work of a man groping his way to the narrow gate of Truth. Indeed, Mr. Bevan shows such sympathetic appreciation of the Catholic mind that one wonders at first how he misses the way. But in philosophy there is no salvation for a thinker who will not trust his reason, and that is what Mr. Bevan fails to do. St. John of the Cross presupposes St. Thomas Aquinas—and Aristotle! The splendid ignorance of the Dark Night follows after the more quiet but clearer knowledge of day.

F.A.W.

The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought. By Nadejda Gorodetzky, B.Litt. (Oxon.). (London: S.P.C.K., 1938). pp. 181.

The title of this book by itself does not prepare the reader for the amount of Russian theological thought, popular tradition, historical, literary and political matter that has been brought together to back up the thesis. In the author's phrase, the theological meaning of the term "the (self)

humiliation of Christ" is kept in mind, but it is first approached on non-theological ground. This non-theological ground leads Mrs. Gorodetzky to search in the Russian national ideal, the ideal of holiness in Russian fiction, the devotional and moral application of the humiliation and not till then does she treat of the doctrinal writings on the Kenosis, a truly goodly array of evidence.

It is important at the outstart to see what the author means by Kenosis: "It even seems to me that the main importance of Russian 'Kenoticism' lies precisely in the fact that there was no 'doctrine' about it. The Christian intuition and experience rather discovered in the Gospels 'the mind of Christ Jesus' than sought to discuss *how* He took upon Himself the form of a servant." . . . "We shall express by 'Kenotic mind, or mood, or character' the features which correspond to the 'mind of Christ' as defined in the second chapter of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians, vv. 5—11, and in 2 Corinthians, viii, 9. Hence, meekness, self-abasement, voluntary poverty, humility, obedience, 'non-resistance,' acceptance of suffering and death would be the expression of the 'Kenotic mind.'" (pp. viii, ix).

The author chooses three theologians as exponents of the doctrine of Kenosis, Vladimir Soloviev, Professor M. M. Tareev, and the archpriest Sergius Bulgakov. As regards Soloviev, it is with some hesitation that she turns to him as "he cannot be regarded as a theologian in the technical sense of the word, though already a philosopher, and besides his manifold reading he consecrated a year to systematic study in theology, and even spent this year as a student of the Moscow Theological Academy." This does not mean that she has little regard for the philosopher for she says: "It is difficult to find a field of thought in the following years which were not influenced or inspired by Soloviev."

But in regard to the doctrine in question, "Soloviev spoke," says the author, "of the relation of the divine and the natural worlds in terms of 'godmanhood' or 'god-manly process.' He means by it (and with him other Russian thinkers) not only Christ in His two natures, not even redeemed mankind as a whole united to Christ. The term surpasses the regions of anthropology; it means the divinization of the whole cosmos as well." (p. 131).

Again: "We repeat that, though Soloviev was not a systematic theologian, he interested us because he spoke of the self-emptying of the divine Logos: he showed the reality of the full human nature of Christ. Christ being the centre of cosmical, historical and redeeming process, His Kenosis becomes thus the basic act of this 'god-manly' process. His

humility, obedience and meekness are proposed as examples for individual morality." (p. 138).

In speaking of Professor Tareev our author says: "he is very important for our investigation. First, he gives the doctrine of Kenosis the place of honour and builds all his system round the humiliation of Christ." His doctrine found a favourable reception among the Orthodox; he avoids the Nestorian tendencies of the extreme Kenotic writers of the West.

Lastly our author deals with Fr. Bulgakov. And in dealing with his idea of Kenosis, his theories concerning Sophia are touched on of necessity for, "we must bear in mind that, for the author himself, every process of Kenosis is based upon and realized in Sophia"; and a very adequate short outline of Bulgakov's concept of Sophia is given.

This will give the reader some idea of the value of the work. Not only are ideas such as Sophia gone into because of its bearing on the main subject, but quite an amount of biographical matter so as to give the right historical, political or literary background is given, in spite of the "purpose of this study being rather religious than literary."

It seems a pity to us that the bibliography which was included with the original thesis (that of a B.Litt. Oxon.) was not given with the present book. It would have been of great value to an already excellent work on modern Orthodox theological thought.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

Through the Lands of the Bible. By H. V. Morton. (Methuen). 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. Morton's lively and well-informed books on Near Eastern lands in their Christian aspect are widely known and justly appreciated. This, the most recent of them, calls for special mention in this review because of the space devoted in it to the Coptic Church as it is to-day, as well as to an up-to-date impression of the Orthodox monastery of Mount Sinai; there are also appreciative references to the Catholic Chaldeans in Irak.

Mr. Morton gives vivid and most interesting accounts of a Coptic wedding and a baptism at which he personally assisted, and some particulars of other services and of his visits to the famous churches of Old Cairo. But still more interesting are his accounts of those most primitive of all existing monasteries, Dair Makarios, Dair Amba Bishoi, Dair as-Suryani and Dair al-Baramus in the Wady Natrun, and Dair Antonios and Dair Boulos near the Red Sea. Mr.

Morton is not only observant and interested in what he sees, he is extraordinarily wide-minded, sympathetic and understanding ; it is possibly to these good qualities that must be attributed the one serious defect of the book—he recounts certain legends, more or less ancient, e.g., about the bones of St. Katharine, without warning his readers that they are historically unreliable or worse.

Through Lands of the Bible is illustrated with photographs no less fascinating and unusual than its text, and it concludes with a fine pæan for Christian Rome, the city of Peter and Paul, leaders of the Apostles.

D.D.A.

The Salvation of the Nations. From the German of Hermann Franke, with a preface by Professor Dr. Karl Adam. (London : Geo. E. J. Coldwell, Ltd.). 4s.

The appearance of this little book is a sign of the times. In eight short chapters the author attempts to show, in the words of Dr. Karl Adam, that the "supernatural community, established in the Blood of Christ, is constructed, so far as its natural coefficients are concerned, upon a racial or national basis." In other words, he is trying to give a theological and Catholic interpretation to the new racialism which is at present astir in Germany. He makes great play with various texts taken from Scripture, the Liturgy and the Fathers—notably St. Ambrose—but whether these can really be made to bear the weight of argumentation to which he subjects them we are inclined to doubt. When the sacred writers used such words as *gentes* and *populi*, did they do so with a theological or mystical *arrière pensée*, or were they simply employing terms which they found useful for conveying the idea of the collectivity of the human race, or of parts thereof? We feel that an at least equally strong case could be made out for the thesis that until modern times Catholic Christianity tended to weaken rather than to strengthen the national or racial outlook of mankind. To us, even after reading Dr. Franke's book, the question appears to be one for historians rather than for theologians, and we should deprecate any widespread tendency to lift the thorny subject of racialism from the arena of historical investigation into the rarefied atmosphere of theological speculation. However, we cannot but praise the ingenuity of Dr. Franke's pioneer effort in this direction. Within its limits his doctrine is unexceptionable, and its presentation is always clear and sometimes original. We must praise also the uniform excellence of Canon George Smith's translation.

A.T.

British Museum. Guide to the Early Christian and Byzantine Antiquities in the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities. O. M. Dalton. 2nd Edition. 1921. (15 plates, 1 sketch map, 105 illustrations).

Our own museums contain a considerable amount of Byzantine interest, as indeed they should, but it is exceptionally difficult to find. It is notoriously difficult to classify objects and to decide on what principle they are to be grouped, whether according to period, provenance or the nature of the object, and it is clear that there has been no grouping under the heading "Byzantine." Perhaps this is wise as the term refers to no particular period and no single place, and the style ranges over so long a period and large a space that to gather its examples would denude other departments. Yet even allowing for this the difficulties of the byzantinologist seem gratuitously increased. It is never easy to see the principle of division between the British Museum and the Victoria and Albert, for this middle period, but even in the one museum the divisions between the departments seem arbitrary. This quotation may be taken as an example (p. 149): "Coptic tapestries are poorly represented in the Christian Room . . . but there is a variety in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities; while the series in the Victoria and Albert Museum is one of the best in existence." Why? The same period, the same place, the same style, the same objects: would one not have a much more adequate idea of Coptic tapestries if one could see the whole series together?

Our collections are richest, under the general and very broad head of Byzantine, in small objects: carvings of ivory, wood and semi-precious stones; vessels of metal and glass; tapestry and jewellery; and of course manuscripts. We have, surprisingly, made no attempt as yet to collect eikons, in spite of the enormous increase of appreciation of Byzantine painting. The time is ripe and good examples can still be had at no very great expense, though it is unlikely that this will remain so long.

The present Guide is misnamed, for 162 of its 191 pages are taken up with an "Introduction" which is a general survey of all Byzantine art, not to say of Christianity and heresies, from a historical and archeological point of view, by no means only with reference to the British Museum. The remaining pages contain a description of the cases. It is excellent that the Museum should publish such a summary which gives a good idea of the development of the style, its penetration into the West and its continuity in the East

down to modern times. It also serves to collect for one's enlightenment the relevant material that the museum really does contain scattered through its various departments.

E.J.B.F.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Centenary Press : *Solitude and Society* ; Nicolas Berdyaev.
True Humanism : Jacques Maritain.

Student Christian Movement Press : *Contemporary Continental Theology* : Walter Marshall Horton.

Ferdinand Schöningh at Paderborn, 1938 : *Am Weissen Meer* : Alexandra Anzerowà.

